

➤HEBRAICA.◀

VOL. III.

JULY, 1887.

NO. 4.

THE TEXT OF JEREMIAH.

BY PROF. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, D. D.,

Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio.

It has long been known that the Septuagint version of Jeremiah differs remarkably from the Massoretic text. Probably the case is not quite so desperate as that of Ezekiel; for the current Hebrew is generally readable. But the fact of the variation is still remarkable and one that deserves investigation. Recent commentators have been content to pronounce in favor of the MT., and to use the LXX. occasionally "as at the most a secondary or tertiary source for the restoration of the text" (*von Orelli*, p. 217). A systematic study of the text critical questions, however, is still needed, such as Professor Cornill has given us in his edition of Ezekiel. The same author promises to edit Isaiah and Jeremiah; and for a decisive answer to the questions raised we may have to wait for these monographs. Meanwhile, however, it is well that the attention of others be directed to the problem. The following notes are intended to state some of the facts that must be taken into consideration.

In the notoriously confused condition of the LXX. text itself, the first point is, What shall we use as the best representative of this text? A provisional answer to this question may be given by means of Origen's Hexapla. Although this work as a whole has perished, fragments enough have come down to us to be of very great use. Especially with regard to the diacritical points we are in a favorable condition. In the Book of Jeremiah several MSS. are extant in Greek (besides the Syriac Hexapla) which testify to these diacritical points. These points distinguish the plus and minus of the LXX. That is to say: it was Origen's intention to mark with an asterisk everything not found in his LXX. which he inserted from the Hebrew (or from Theodotion's version), and to mark with an obelos everything in his LXX. which is not in the Hebrew. Evidently, if we find a MS. which *omits* whatever the hexaplar MSS. give with an asterisk, and at the same time *contains* what these mark by an obelos, we may safely claim that

we have Origen's text before us. The MS. which most nearly approximates this may be taken as the best one for our purpose until we get the really critical edition for which we have been waiting so long. Very little study will show us that the Vatican MS. (and the Roman edition based upon it) more nearly than any other now accessible fulfills these conditions. The following figures are fairly correct, I think; absolute accuracy is difficult to attain. In making them up I have counted every instance of the omission or insertion of a particle which would affect by a single letter the Hebrew text (as *kai* = ׀).

Asterisks are expressly testified in 739 instances in the Book of Jeremiah. The words so marked are omitted from Tischendorf's text in all but fifty cases. On the other hand, Tischendorf omits one or more words in 357 cases in which the asterisk seems not to be certified. As these last are in large proportion particles or small words, we might easily suppose the scribes not to have thought them worth designating in copying. More difficult is the case of the *plus* of the LXX. The obelos occurs in seventy-four instances, of which all but twelve correspond with our Greek text. But, in addition, our Greek text inserts a word or more in no less than 245 cases. Whatever else we may conclude from these figures, we can hardly suppose (for Jeremiah at any rate), as Cornill does, that the Vaticanus is a copy made from the Hexapla with the intention of restoring the genuine LXX. under the guidance of the diacritical marks (cf. Cornill, p. 84). The value of our edition for the comparison in hand, however, will be quite as great, because, by its greater variation from the MT. it shows itself even nearer the original LXX. than any text we can now command. For a brief consideration of the variants in Holmes and Parsons' edition shows that they have almost always arisen from hexaplar intermixture.

Taking Tischendorf's text, then, as on the whole a satisfactory representative of the Greek version, how does it differ from the received Hebrew? The answer is well known—it is considerably shorter. How now shall we account for this difference? The accepted answer is "by the careless and arbitrary manner in which the translators dealt with their text, leaving out words which they did not understand or which seemed to them superfluous." But while this is the current answer, another is, to say the least, conceivable—we may suppose that the *plus* of the MT. is in large part the insertion of scribes.

As between the two answers, it will readily be confessed that the probabilities, as judged by the ordinary observation of the laws of transmission, are on the side of the latter. A text is more likely to grow in the process of transmission than to shrink. The rhetorical expansion of an obscure phrase is more likely than its omission. The insertion of synonyms is more likely than their omission. The influence of parallel passages tends to swell the shorter form. The *a priori* probability then is in favor of the shorter text—in this case in favor of the LXX. The argument from age is in the same direction. The LXX. represents a He-

brew text considerably earlier than the time to which we can trace the type perpetuated in the MT. But, after all, these arguments only create a presumption. The presumption is strengthened by the ordinary conduct of the Greek translators, and, indeed, as the figures given above will show, even in the Book of Jeremiah they have often inserted words *as well as omitted* them, if the variations are to be referred to them at all, and this would be inexplicable. That is to say, while we might explain the omissions on the ground of a desire to be as concise as possible, we could not, in consistency with this, account for the insertions at all.

It may be said, indeed, that the argument will apply equally well to the MT. If its *plus* is the result of insertions, then we are at a loss to account for its *minus*. But this is only an apparent difficulty. The general rule is that the shorter text is original. Both LXX. and MT. have suffered from the tendency of scribes (continued through a long series of hands it must be remembered), a tendency to expand their text. Only they have not been affected uniformly, and the MT. has suffered more than the other. If this natural explanation be the correct one, an examination of the variations ought to show it. It is scarcely possible that the omission of some thousands of words from a book the size of Jeremiah should leave no traces in the resulting text.

The phrase **יְהוָה נָא** occurs in the Hebrew of Jeremiah 168 times, if we may trust the concordance. In 46 of these it is lacking in the LXX. It needs no reflection to see that the phrase, from the very fact of its occurring so often, would easily be inserted in new passages. If the phrase were original in all cases, we should expect it to be omitted where the omission would least disturb the sense. In such cases as the following: "Therefore behold the days come, *saith Yahweh*, that it shall no more be said" (VII. 32), "At that time, *saith Yahweh*, they shall bring forth" (VIII. 1), "For these should I not visit, *saith Yahweh*, or upon such a nation" (IX. 8), "And it shall be if ye hearken to me, *saith Yahweh*, not to carry a burden" (XVII. 24),—in these cases the LXX. testifies to the reading, while the cases of apparent omission are many of them where the phrase occurs at the end of a verse.¹

The cases of the divine name may be grouped together. The combination **יְהוָה אֲדוֹנִי** (or **אֲדוֹנִי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת**) is found ten times in the Hebrew text. In only three of these it is witnessed by the LXX. In two of these, which are cases of direct personal address (I. 6; IV. 10) we find *δέσποτα κύριε*, in the other we have *κυρίῳ Θεῷ* (L.²⁵). It is probable that the first two are the only original instances. If the **אֲדוֹנִי** was omitted or *Θεός* substituted for it eight times, why not in the other two? That a Jewish editor, however, should *insert* **אֲדוֹנִי** cannot be considered

¹ It is probable that the discrepancy was originally larger than is indicated above. The great majority of cases in which the phrase remains in the Greek render it *λέγει κύριος*. Those MSS. which have inserted it later generally render *φησὶ κύριος*. But *φησὶ κύριος* occurs in a few instances in the Roman text. It is natural to suspect that they also are not original.

surprising. The phrase **כה אמר יהוה** occurs over a hundred times in the MT., while in thirty-two instances we find **כה אמר יהוה צבאות**; once we have **כה אמר יהוה אלהי צבאות**; thirteen times **כה אמר יהוה צבאות ישראל**; three times **כה אמר יהוה אלהי ישראל**; thirteen times **כה אמר יהוה אלהי ישראל**. In contrast with this confused condition of things we find that the LXX. reads *κύριος* except in the following: xv. 16; xxii. 27; xxxii. 14, and xliv. 7, in which we find *κύριος παντοκράτωρ* (which is elsewhere the translation of **יהוה צבאות**) and six other cases where we have *κύριος ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ*. According to this, Jeremiah used *Yahweh of Hosts* or *Yahweh God of Israel* only rarely, and, as we may suppose, when he wished to be emphatic, and he never strung together *Yahweh God of Hosts God of Israel*, or like long drawn out titles. This usage is consistent and tells in favor of the LXX., while it is only too easy for a copyist to multiply titles under the impression that he is adding to the solemnity of the address.¹ Outside the phrase **כה אמר יהוה** the MT. has in one instance **יהוה צבאות**, in one it has **יהוה צבאות ישראל** and in fourteen **יהוה צבאות**. In all these cases² but six, the LXX. has simply *κύριος*, and in these six (three of them are in chapters L. and LI.) it reads *κύριος παντοκράτωρ*. The LXX. is thus consistent with itself.

We may next group together explicative words and phrases. In thirty-five cases **כל** of the Hebrew has no equivalent in the Greek,—one of the easiest words to insert; **לאמר** is omitted eight times; **הנביא** after a proper name (usually that of Jeremiah) is omitted twenty-four times, **מלך יהודה** four times; **מלך בבל** twice, **נבוכדראצא** before **מלך בבל** seven times. The omission of **בבלה** (three times), **כה אמר יהוה** (three) and **השכם ודבר** are precisely similar. In all of them the insertion by a scribe is almost to be expected, and the shorter form is original. Notice the following like examples, where the brackets indicate the omission by the LXX.: xiii. 7, "And I took the girdle from the place where I had hidden it, and behold [the girdle] was spoiled." The omission of the subject is characteristic of the Hebrew. xix. 9, "In the siege and in the straitness with which their enemies [and those seeking their life] shall straiten them." xx. 5, "And I will give all the treasure of this city and all its property [and all its precious things], and all the treasures of the kings of Judah [will I give] into the hand of their enemies [and they shall plunder them and take them], and they shall bring them to Babylon." xxv. 9, "Behold, I will send and take [all] the

¹ One passage (xxxiii. 12) reads *κύριος δυνάμεων* in our present Greek text. The second word, however, is omitted by a considerable number of MSS., and is on the face of it suspicious, because we find elsewhere *παντοκράτωρ*. For the sake of completeness it may be added that **נאם ארונ' יהוה צב' יהוה צב'** is found twice, and **נאם יהוה צב' יהוה צב'** twice; in three of these the LXX. has simply *κύριος*, once it reads *κύριος ὁ Θεός σου*, apparently borrowing from the first half of the same verse (ii. 19).

² It is possible that I have overlooked some, as the concordances are not very reliable on such frequently recurring phrases.

families of the north [saith Yahweh and unto Nebuchadressar, king of Babylon, my servant], and will bring them upon this land." In all these instances the shorter reading makes perfectly good sense.

To enforce this point I will now give a few examples in the Hebrew form witnessed by the LXX., and then give separately the additional matter of the MT. If this additional matter really belongs to the text, the fact will easily be discovered.

i. 18.—והנה נתתיך היום לעיר מבצר ולחומות נחשת למלכי יהודה—
לשריה ולעם הארץ:

MT. inserts and על-כל הארץ, ולעמוד ברזל, אני

vii. 17.—.האינך ראה מה המה עשים בחוצות ירושלם: MT. inserts
בערי יהודה ו

vii. 26.—.הרעו inserted, ויקשו את-ערפם מאבותם.

xi. 4.—.אותם כ inserted, שמעו בקולי ועשיתם כל אשר אצוה.

xii. 3.—.תראני inserted, ואתה יהוה ידעתני ובחנת לבי אתך.

xiii. 4.—.אשר קנית inserted, קח את האזור אשר על מתניך.

xiii. 17.—.ורמע תרמע added—תבכה נפשי מפני גוה ותרד עיני דמעה.

xviii. 4.—.כחמר and MT. inserts, ונשחת הכלי אשר הוא עשה בידו—
changes ביד היוצר into בידו.

xix. 5.—.לשרף את בניהם באש אשר לא צויתי ולא עלתה על לבי.
MT. inserts and עלות לבעל, ולא דברתי.

xxi. 4.—.כה אמר יהוה הנני מסב את כלי המלחמה אשר אתם
נלחמים בם את-הכשרים הצרים עליכם מחוץ לחומה אל תוך העיר
הזאת:

The insertions are and את-מלך בבל ו, אשר בידכם, אלהי ישראל
ואספתי אותם.

xxii. 25.—.ונתתיך ביד מבקשי נפשך אשר אתה יגור מפניהם;
insertions and ביד, הכשרים, וביד נבוכדראצר מלך בבל וביד.

Cf. further the following:

vi. 16, 17, "Thus saith Yahweh:
Call to the mourning women that they may come,
And to the cunning women send that they may hasten,
And let them take up for us a lamentation."

The structure, which is here quite regular, is disturbed by the Massoretic insertions. xxv. 3, 4, "From the thirteenth year of Josiah, son of Amon, king of Judah, and to this day, three and twenty years I have spoken to you, rising early and speaking, and I have sent to you my servants the prophets, rising early and sending, and you have not heard and have not inclined your ear." Eight words

are inserted by the MT. xxv. 33, "And the slain of Yahweh in that day [LXX., in the day of Yahweh] shall be from the end of the earth to the end of the earth, and shall not be buried; for dung on the face of the ground they shall be." MT. inserts "they shall not be mourned and shall not be gathered." xli. 1-3, "And in the seventh month came Ishmael, son of Nethaniah, son of Elishama, of the seed royal, and ten men with him, unto Gedaliah to Mizpah, and they ate bread there together. And Ishmael and the ten men with him arose and smote Gedaliah whom the king of Babylon had appointed in the land, and all the Jews which were with him in Mizpah, and the Chaldees which were found there." For the more than twenty words inserted by the MT. I will refer to the original. The sense is entirely clear without them.

While the insertions in the above passages are in general easily accounted for, there are some plain instances of duplication, as ix. 4; **הנני מאכילם [את-]** **העם הזה]** לענה ואכלהו ויכלהו, where the clause in brackets really duplicates the suffix immediately preceding. In this way arose apparently the reading **ואכלהו ויכלהו** in x. 25. In xi. 13, we read "And as the number of the streets of Jerusalem ye have placed altars to Bosheth, altars to sacrifice to Baal;" LXX. has simply *βωμὸς θυμῶν τῇ Βάαλ*. The substitution of Bosheth for Baal is known from other parts of the Old Testament. Here the two readings are combined in the Hebrew, but not yet in the Greek. Another example is in the passage already quoted (xli. 3), where MT. reads, "And all the Jews which were with him *with Gedaliah*." Cf. also li. 56, **כי בא עליה על כבל שורר**.

Heretofore we have considered the *plus* of the MT. Let us look at some of the *alternate readings*. After Jeremiah is shown a **סיר נפוח** he adds (i. 14) "And Yahweh said to me: From the North evil is *opened* (**תפתח**) upon all the inhabitants of the land." The LXX. reads apparently **תנפח**, preserving the paronomasia. In iii. 22 the Hebrew has **ארפה משובותיכם**; for the second word we find *τὰ συντρέμματα ὑμῶν* which of course represents **משברותיכם**. xv. 14 now reads, "And I will make thine enemies to pass over into a land thou knowest not." For **והעברתי** LXX. reads **והעברתיך**—"And I will make thee to serve thine enemies in a land thou knowest not," evidently more in accord with the context, confirmed also by the Targum which has **ותשתעבדון**. "And ye shall serve there other gods which shall not show you mercy" (so LXX. in xvi. 3); MT. has the difficult phrase **אשר לא אתן לכם חנינה**. A well known case is xxiii. 33, "And when this people or prophet or priest shall ask thee saying, What is the burden of Yahweh? then thou shalt say to them *Ye are the burden*"—**אתם המשא** for which in the MT. we find the incomprehensible **את-מה-משא**. xli. 9, "And the pit into which Ishmael cast all whom he had smitten was the great pit"—so LXX. reading **בור גדול** for which MT. gives again an incomprehensible reading **ביר גדליהו**. In one or two of these in-

stances we might be in doubt whether the LXX. deserves the preference; but they show at least that the translators did not simply guess, but if they made mistakes, the mistakes arose from the confusion of similar forms for which their Hebrew copy is to be held responsible. So when they in an unvocalized text confused רעים and רעים, נם and נם, שמה and שמה, we can hardly lay it to carelessness. Further examples of confusion of similar letters in their Hebrew copy are תגור for תגור (iv. 1), ילרו for ילכו (xii. 2), והשיבותים for והשיבותים (xii. 15), ישובו for ישמעו (xii. 17), אמר for אמר (xv. 11), רעתך for רעתך (xxii. 22), חרב for חרון (xxv. 38), שם for בם (xli. 8, this and the preceding are probably right in the LXX.), כה for כה (ix. 15).

There is plenty of evidence therefore that the MS. from which the version was made has suffered in transmission. The influences which affected it are the same in kind as those we have discovered affecting the MT. Although the LXX. is so much shorter, it has in places suffered the same kind of inflation, as in xxi. 3, where it adds after Zedekiah βασιλέα Ιουδα, or xxi. 5, where it inserts πάντας, or xxiv. 1, where it adds a fourth class to the three carried captive according to the Hebrew, or xxxii. 28, where it inserts after Yahweh ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ. In fact the same tendencies affected the LXX. after its translation; for a considerable group of MSS. (the same which Cornill supposes to represent Hesychius' recension) has in several instances + ὁ Θεός from which the other groups are free.

The principle that the more difficult reading is to be preferred, is often abused. There is a sense in which an ungrammatical expression is more difficult than a correct one. To take one more example from Jeremiah (xxv. 26); the reading of the MT. is ואת-כל-הממלכות הארץ אשר-על פני האדמה. Any tyro knows that הממלכות הארץ is ungrammatical. The LXX. omits הארץ and is therefore in a sense less difficult. But if we state the rule as it is stated by Westcott and Hort—that reading is original which will account for the existence of the other—we shall have a better guide. If the shorter reading is the original we can easily account for the longer as the work of an absent-minded scribe to whom the phrase כל ממלכות הארץ was familiar. But we cannot account for the longer reading as the work of Jeremiah at all. Such glaring instances are, of course, rare, but some of those quoted above are scarcely less convincing.

Adequate treatment of the text of Jeremiah would require a volume. The cases treated in this paper are, however, I think fair examples of the state of the text, and, if so, they justify the conclusion that the LXX. was made from a better text than the one preserved for us by the synagogue. The LXX. is therefore a source for the text of the very first importance. Both LXX. and MT., however, have suffered from the same tendencies, and by judicious criticism it is possible to construct from both a better text than that now shown by either one. This critical work is our need.

Two questions have not been referred to here. One concerns the original arrangement of the prophecies, the other concerns the longer sections not found in the LXX. The answer to these questions is not necessarily influenced by pronouncing in favor of the LXX. in general. It is entirely possible that a better MS. should suffer dislocation and mutilation from which another has escaped.

THE MONOLITH INSCRIPTION OF SALMANESER II.

BY JAMES A. CRAIG, PH. D.,

Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio.

In the following paper is found for the first time a translation, with accompanying transcription, in syllables, of the valuable Monolith Inscription of Salmaneser II., whose reign forms one of the most interesting chapters in Assyrian history. Before commencing this work, a collation of the text was an indispensable prerequisite, as may be seen from the number of corrections which, for purpose of comparison, I have here inserted. The collation of this text, which was the main object of a visit to the British Museum, where, during the summer of '85, I spent six weeks in the copying of texts, was done with the utmost care, the doubtful portions being frequently revised under the best attainable lights. The text, as edited in WAI., vol. III., seems to have been hurriedly executed, as even the most common signs are not exactly reproduced, as may be seen by referring to corrections No. 189. Where those minor variations occur, I have not always attempted to reproduce them, as this would make the work too cumbrous, and could satisfactorily be done only by a complete re-editing of the texts; and as they are of importance only as showing the exact form of writing.

The essential improvements which I have been able to make in the text, such, e. g., as the reading of the god "Nanir," etc., as well as my rendering of the text on this basis, will, I trust, be of some value to the science. Partial translations have hitherto been given, as in Prof. Schrader's KAT. and KGF., by Menant, in *Annales des Rois d'Assyrie*, and a translation in *Records of the Past*, by Prof. Sayce. A comparison of these with that here contained will show the necessity of the present undertaking. Compare, e. g., Prof. Sayce's translation of Col. II. 1. 10 with the correct translation: "To the land of Atalur, an uninhabited place of deserts and low-lying, I went. Its tribute I appointed." This is a mere guess. It is a good example of "giving a sort of rough guess at the signification of a sentence," which Prof. Sayce, in his *Lectures on the Assyrian Language*, p. 7, so justly condemns. The passage reads: "To the mountains of the land of Atalur, where an image of Ašur-irbê was erected, I went. An image with his image I erected." Still there is not even an interrogation mark affixed! Menant begins to translate at line 13.

NOTE.—In the transcription I have adhered to the value of the signs as represented in Prof. Delitzsch's *Lesestuecke*, indicating the length of the vowels otherwise only where ideographs occur.

I embrace this opportunity of acknowledging my indebtedness to my friend, Mr. Pinches, of the British Museum, who spared no pains to render me every aid for the facilitation of my work, and, above all, to my esteemed Professor, Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch, whose advice and instruction and friendly feeling bind me to him as a thankful pupil in lasting obligation.

INTRODUCTION.

The Name of Salmaneser plays an important role in Assyrian history, there being no less than four kings of this name, viz., Salm. I., B. C. 1300-1271, the father of Tukultiadar I.; Salm. II., 860-824; Salm. III., 783-773, and Salm. IV., 727-722. The various methods of writing the name cannot be produced here. For the pronunciation, Šulmânašarêd = "Šulmân is prince," see Schrader, ZKF., Bd. II., 197, f.

Life. Salmaneser II., the son of Asurnazirpal and grandson of Tukultiadar II., whose long reign of thirty-five years was full of military activity and achievement, occupied the throne of Assyria from 860-824 B. C. He followed hard in the footsteps of his father, Asurnazirpal, extending his rule in all directions and carrying terror and bloodshed wherever he went. After he had seated himself, with all the accompanying ceremonial pomp, as he expressly tells us, upon the throne, he lost no time until he began his work of conquest. Having defeated Ninni of Simesi, and taken tribute from the adjacent tribes, he extended his march to Hupuskia on the upper Zab, overwhelmed and defeated his opposers and, having imposed on them taxes and tribute, pushed his way up through the Nairi-land with like results to the land of Urartu along the Araxes. After other expeditions on the Tigris he began operations on the Euphrates, receiving tribute from Katazilu of Kummuh, and afterwards from the confederate forces on the west of the Euphrates. The Phœnician coast was next the scene of his triumphal march. In 858 he overcame Ahuni of Til-barsip on the Euphrates, descended upon the other side and destroyed the neighboring towns. In the following year he repeated the attack on Til-barsip, took the city, committing the usual atrocities, built a palace within it, and changed its name to Kar-Salmaneser. In 856 Ahuni, after a terrible battle in Mount Šetamrat, was captured and, with his forces, etc., was carried off to Assyria. In 854 he left Nineveh again, crossed the Euphrates, took tribute from Carchemish and Kummuh, and later, having attacked Archulina of Hamath, engaged in a battle at Karkar against the confederate forces of twelve kings; among whom were *Benhadad II.*, of *Damaskus*, and *Ahab*, of *Israel*. The losses on both sides were heavy and the victory a doubtful one. After having turned his strength against the Babylonian usurper Merodachbalusate (see appendix) whom he put to death, he repeated his attacks on Syria. In 851, 850, 846 we find him in the west. The latter year, with 120,000 men, he marched against

Benhadad, put to flight the Syrians, pillaged their cities and took their spoil; but in 842 Syria was still unsubdued. According to III R., V., No. 6, he had again to contend for the mastery with Hazael of Damaskus, and three years later there was only tribute as before. Further expeditions, particularly to the northward of the Armenian mountains to the land of Namri, and westward to Media, were made. When he became too infirm to take the field, he gave the command to Dânašur, commander-in-chief, and, while he himself was obliged to remain in Chalah, his forces were executing his commands in the north country of Urartu and Patûi. The end of his reign, which was followed by the subjugation of Babylon to Assyria, largely through the extension of power due to him, according to Samsibin(?) was disturbed by an insurrection, set on foot by a faithless son, which was afterwards quelled by his faithful son and successor Samsibin(?).

Inscriptions.

1) The Monolith Inscription found at Kurkh on the Tigris, about twenty miles distant from Diarbekhr, and now in the British Museum. The monolith measures 2 m. 16 cm. in length, 85 cm. in width, and 21 cm. in thickness. The writing extends on the back 1 m. 89 cm., and on the front, 1 m. 20 cm. On the front side is a life-size sculptured figure of the king in the usual royal attire. Owing to the fringe of the garment and the partial decomposition of the stone, the writing is sometimes difficult to decipher.

2) The Black Obelisk. Compound of basalt. It narrates the events according to the years of his reign, and exhibits in five beautiful bas reliefs, which extend completely around the four sides, tributary peoples bringing various animals and objects, cloths and ivory to their acknowledged conqueror.

3) The Bull Inscriptions. Both these and the obelisk were found in the palace of Salmaneser at Chalah. The texts are to be found in Layard's *Inscriptions*.

4) Bronze Gates—a wonderful work of art—bear representations of battles, tortures, etc., etc., and an inscription. They were discovered by Mr. Rassam at Balawat. Another set of doors crumbled to pieces in being removed.

5) The Throne Inscription. Given in Appendix, which see.

6) A small inscription containing an account of Salmaneser's expedition against Syria during his eighteenth year. Contained I R. 5, No. 6, Delitzsch's *ALS.*, p. 98.

7) Several bricks. One which I copied in the British Museum, a duplicate of which Rev. Mr. Parry, D. D., was kind enough to send me a copy, is in his possession. They read as follows:

“Salmaneser, the great king, the powerful king, the king of multitudes, the king of Assyria, the son of Asurnazirpal, the great king, the powerful king, the king of multitudes, the son of Tiglath-adar, the king of multitudes, king of Assyria, who rebuilt? (ri-sip-tu) the tower of the city of Chalah.” Cf. Layard's *Inscriptions*, p. 78.

TRANSLITERATION.

(III R., pp. 7, 8.)*

COL. I.

1. ilu A-šur bêlu rabu-ú šar gim-rat¹ ilâ-ni rabûtê ilu A-nu šar ilu Igiġê u
ilu A-nun-na-ki bêl mâtâtê ilu Bêl a-bu ilâni mu-šim šimâti
2. mu-šir ê-šu-rat [šamê-ê irši]tim ilu Ê-a ir-sú šar apsé [rabu]^{2a}-ú nik-la²-ti
ilu Na³-nir šamê-ê iršitim ilu ê-têl-lu ilu Ša-maš
3. dân kibrâtê muš-tê-šir⁴ tê-ni⁵-šê-ê-tê ilu Istar bê-lit kabli u taġâzi ša mê-lul-
ta-ša tukuntu ilâni rabûtê râ'im-ut šarrû-ti-ia
4. bêlû-ti kiš-šû-ti u ša⁶-pi-ru-ti ú⁷-šar-bu šû-mê kab-tu zik-ri ši⁸-i-ra muġ⁹?-hur
bêl-ê ma-'a-diš iš-ku-nu i-ni-ni.
5. Šulmânu-ašarêdu šar kiš-šat nišê rubû-ú šangû Ašûr šarru dan-nu šar mâtu Aššûr
šar kul-lat kib-rat arba'-i ilu Šam-sû kiš-šat nišê
6. mur-tê-du-ú ka-liš mâtâtê šarru ba-'a-it [ilâ]ni ni-šit ê-[ni] ^{8a}[ilu] Bêl šakkânâk
Ašûr pit-ku-du rubû-ú na-a-du a-mê-ru
7. [du]-ur-ġê ũ šap-ša-kê mu-kab-bi-is ri-šê-ti-ê ša šadê-ê ka-liš hur-ša-a-ni ma-ġir
bilti ⁹ ũ i-gi-si-ê
8. [kâli-š]i-na kibrâtê mu-pat-tu-ú tu-da-ti ša ê-lis ũ šap-liš ša a-na ti-ib taġâzi-šu
dan-ni kibrâtê ul-ta-nap-ša-ka
9. i-ġi-lu mâtâtê ina mê-dil id-du-ti-šu iš-da-ši-na; zikaru dan-nu ša ina tukul-ti
Ašûr ilu Ša-maš ilâni ri-šê-šû ittala-ku-ma
10. ina mal-kê ša kib-rat arba'-i ša-nin-šu lâ išu-ú šar¹⁰ mâtâtê šar-ġu ša ar-ġê pa-
aš-ku-tê ittala-ku iš-tam-da-ġu šadê-ê u tâmâtê
11. apal^m. Ašûr-nâšir-pal šakan ilu Bêl šangû Ašûr ša šangû-su êli ilâni i-tê-bu-ma
mâtâtê nap-ġar-ši-na a-na šêpê-šû u-šak-ni-šu nab-ni-tu êllu-tu ša ^m. Tukultî-
Adar
12. ša kul-lat za-i-rê-šû¹¹ i-ni-ru-ma is-pu-nu a-bu-ba-ni-iš. Ê-nu-ma Ašûr bêlu
rabû-ú ina ku-un [libbi¹²]-šû ina¹³ inâti-šu¹⁴ êllâti ud-da-ni-ma
13. rê-'u-ut mâtu Aššûr ib-ba-an-ni kakku dan-nu [muš]-šam-kit lâ ma-ġi-ri u-šat-
mê-ġa-ni-ma a-ġa-a [ši-ra] u-pir-ra¹⁵ bêlu-ti nap-ġar mâtâtê
14. tu . . . [na-ki]-ru-ut Ašûr a-na pê-li u šuk-nu-šê ag-ġiš u-ma-'i-ra-an-ni
ina ûmê?-šû-ma ina šur-rat šarru¹⁷-ti-ia ina maġ-ri-ê palî-ia
15. ina kussê šarru-ti rabi-iš u-šê-bu narkâbâte ummânâtê-'a¹⁶ ad-ki ina ni-ri-bi ša
mâtu Si-mê-si êru-ub¹⁸ a¹⁹⁻²⁰-na ^{alu}A-ri-di âl dan-nu-ti-šu
16. ša ^m. Ni-in²¹-ni ak¹⁸⁹-tê-rib âla a-si-bi ak¹⁸⁹-ta-šad dikta-šu ma'attu a-duk šal-
la-su²² aš-lu-la a-si-tu ša kakkadê ina pu-ut âli-šu ar-šip
17. ²³batûlê-šu-nu ^{šal²⁴}ba-tu-la-tê-šu-nu a-na ma-ak-lu-tê ašrup. Ki-i ina ^{alu}A-ri-
di-ma us²⁵-ba-ku-ni ma-da-tu ša mâtu Har-ġa-a-a²⁶⁻²⁷ mâtu Har-ma-sa-a-a

* The numbers above the signs refer to "Corrections."

† The remaining traces of the sign (in R. "u" "nap") seems to be in favor of muġ.

‡ R.

TRANSLATION.

COL. I.

1. Ašur, the great lord, the king of all* the great gods, Anu, king of the Igigi and Anunnaki, the lord of lands, Bêl, the father of the gods the determiner of destinies, ²who fixes the bounds (bands) of (heaven and) earth, Ea, the decider, the king of the abyss, great in wise devices, Nanir, of heaven and
3. earth, the majestic, Šamaš, ³the judge of the (four) quarters of the globe, the ruler of mankind, Istar, the queen of war and battle, whose command is
4. war; the great gods, the favorers of my sovereignty, ⁴lordship, might and rule have they increased, my renowned name, my majestic title, *is†* come before
5. rulers, abundantly have they (the gods) established my i-ni-ni (or *me* ?). ⁵Salmaneser, the king of the multitude of men, the prince, the priest of Ašur, the mighty king, the king of the land of Assyria, the king of the whole of the
6. four regions, the sun of all mankind, ⁶the ruler (who rules fully) of all lands, the king chosen of the gods, the beloved of Bêl, the governor of Ašur, the circumspect, the great, the majestic, who looks upon ⁷paths and declivities, who treads the peaks of mountains (and) forests everywhere, who receives the
8. tribute and presents of ⁸all regions, who opens up the roads both above and below, who, by the approach of his mighty battle, distresses the regions and
9. ⁹shakes‡ countries to their foundations in the power of his might,—the manly, the mighty, who by the aid of Ašur (and) Šamaš, the gods his helpers, marches,
10. and ¹⁰among the princes of the four regions has no rival; king of countries, the powerful (one) who marches over declivitous routes, traverses mountains
11. and seas, ¹¹the son of Ašurnazirpal, the governor‡ of Bêl, the priest (servant) of Ašur, whose priesthood being well-pleasing unto the gods,|| they subjected
12. all lands to his feet, the brilliant descendant of Tiglath-adar ¹²who subjugated all his enemies and hurled them down as a deluge.—At the time when Ašur, the great lord, in the fidelity (or fixedness) of his heart, with his clear eyes
13. recognized (knew) me and to the ¹³sovereignty of the land of Assyria called me, a powerful weapon, the overthrower of the insubordinate, he bestowed¶ upon me, and with a majestic crown adorned (decked ?) my sovereignty, all
14. lands ¹⁴. the enemies of Ašur to subjugate and subdue sternly did he command me.
15. In those days, at the beginning of my rule, in my first year of rule, ¹⁵(as) upon the throne of sovereignty ceremoniously I seated myself, the chariots, my forces, I assembled; into the pass of the land of Simesi I entered. To
16. the city of Aridi, the stronghold ¹⁶of Ninni, I approached. The city I besieged, I took. Many of his warriors I slew. His spoil I carried off. A column (row) of heads, at the entrance of the city-gate, I fixed together.
17. ¹⁷Their young men, their young women, I burned up. While I was quartered

* = totality.

† See notes.

‡ Professor Sayce leaves out the word "ihilu" and supplies "hope" instead (which robs the passage both of its poetry and meaning), or perhaps had in mind תְּהִלָּת, תְּהִלָּת.

§ The sign ša might mean šiknu; but in view of Sargon-Inscr. 3, šaknu is certainly correct here.

|| Lit., whose priesthood was well-pleasing unto the gods and they, etc.

¶ Lit., caused me to hold.

18. mâtu Si-mê-sa-a-a mâtu Si-mê-ra-a-a mâtu Si-riš-a-a mâtu Ul-ma-ni-a-a sîsê šimd-at nîri alpê šêni karânê amḥur ištu¹⁸⁹ⁱ âlu A-ri-di
19. at-tu-muš arḥi pa-aš-ku-tê šadê mar-šu-ti ša kîma šê-lu-ut paṭri parzilli a-na šamê-ê zi-kip-ta šak-nu ina aggulat êrê siparri ak-ḫur narkabâtê^{28*}
20. ummânâtê ú-šê-tik a-na âlu Hu-pu-uš-ki-a ak-tê-rib âlu Hu-pu-uš-ki-a a-di C âlâni²⁹ ša li-mê-tu-šú ina išâti aš-ru-up m. Ka-ki-a
21. šar mâtu Na-i-ri ú si-tê-it ummânâtê-šu ištu pa-an na-mur-rat kakkê-'a ip-la-ḫu-ma šadê-ê dan-nu-ti iṣ-ba-tu arki-šu-nu ana šadê-ê ê-li
22. taḫâzu dan-nu ina ki-rib šadê-ê aš-ku-un abikta-šu-nu am-ḫa-aš narkabâtê ummânâtê³⁰ sîsê šimd-at nîri ištu^{189j} ki-rib šadê-ê ú-tê-ra pul-ḫê mê-lam-mê
23. ša Ašûr bêli-ia iṣ-ḫu-pu-šu-nu-ti ur³¹-du-ni šêpê-ia iṣ-ba-tu biltu u ma-da-tu êli-šu-nu ú-kin ištu^{189k} âlu Hu-pu-uš-ki-a at-tu-muš
24. a-na âlu Su-gu-ni-a âl dan-nu-ti-šu ša m. A-ra^{189m} mê mâtu U-ra¹⁸⁹ⁿ ar-ṭa-a³² ak-tê-rib âla a-si-bi ak^{189o}-ta-šad dîkta-šu-nu ma-'a-tu a-dûk
25. šal³³-la-su aš-lu-la a-si-tu ša kakkadê ina pu-ut âli-šu ar-šip XIV âlâ-ni šá^{189p} li-mê-tu-šu ina išâti aš-ru-up ištu âlu Su-gu-ni-a
26. at-tu-muš a-na tâm-di ša mâtu Na-i-ri at-ta-rad kakkê-ia ina tâm-di ú-lil immeru nikê ana ilâni-ia ak-ki ina ú-mê-šú-ma ša-lam bu-na-ni-ia
27. êpu-uš ta-nit-ti Ašûr bêli rubi-ê bêli-ia u lí-ti kiš-šú-ti-ia ina ki-rib-šu al-ṭur ina êli tâm-di u-šê-ziz ina ta-ia-ar-ti-ia
28. ša tâm³⁴-di ma-da³⁵-tu ša m. A-su³⁶ ú mâtu Gu-za-na-a^{36a} mat(?) sîsê alpê šêni karânê II ud³⁷-ra-a-tê šá šinâ gu-un-gu-li-pi am-ḫur
29. a-na âli-ia Aššûr ub-la. Ina araḫ Airi ûm XIII ištu^{189q} âlu Ninua at-tu-muš nâru Idiklat ê-tê-bir šadû Ha-sa-mu šadû Di-ḫ-nu-nu [at]-ta-bal-kat
30. ana âlu La-'a-la-'a-tê ša m. A-ḫu-ni apal A-di-ni ak-tê-rib pu-ul-ḫê mê-lam-mê ša Ašûr bêli-ia iṣ-ḫu-pu-šu³⁹-nu⁴⁰ a-[na]
31. ê-lu-ú âla ab-bu-ul ak-ḫur ina išâti aš-ru-up iṣ-tu âlu La-'a-la-'a-ti at-tu-muš a⁴¹-[na]
32. ša m. A-ḫu-ni apal A-di-ni ak-tê-rib m. A-ḫu-ni apal A-di-ni a-na gi-biṣ umm⁴²[â-nâtê-šu it-ta-ki]ṭ-ma ḫabla u taḫâza [ana ê-piṣ] . . a-ni. I-na tukul-ti Ašûr
33. u ilâni rabûtê bêlê-ia it⁴³-ti-šu am-daḫ-ḫi-iṣ a-bi-ik-ta-[šú] ⁴⁴aš-kun i-na âli-šu ê-sir⁴⁵-šu ištu âlu Ki-[ra]?-ka at-tu-muš
34. a-na âlu Bur-mar-'a-na ša A-ḫu-ni apal A-di-ni [a-likṭ âla] a⁴⁶-si-bi ak-ta-šad V šú-ši mun-daḫ-šê-šu-nu ina kakkê u-šam-[kit⁴⁷] a-si-tu ša kakkadê
35. [i-na⁴⁸ pu-ut âli-šu ar-šip] . 16 cm. broken. . ma-da-tu ša m. Ha-pi-ni âlu Til-ab-na-a ša m. Ga-'a-u-ni âlu Sa-ru? . . . a? ⁴⁹ m. Gi-ri-Rimmân
36. kaspera ḫurâša alpê šêni karânê am-ḫur ištu âlu Bur-mar-'a-na at-tu-muš ina êlippê mašak taḫ⁵⁰-ši-ê nâru Purâtu
37. ê-tê-bir ma-da-tu šá^{50a} m. Ka-ta-zi-li^{50b} mâtu Ku-mu-ḫa-a-a kaspera ḫurâša alpê šêni karânê am-ḫur a-na mâtu⁵¹[Pa-ḫar-ru]-uḫ-bu-ni

* No pl. sign on Monolith, hence prop. narkabta.

† Restored by comparison with Obv. II., 15, III R., 5, No. 6, 42 and 43.

‡ or [ak-tê-rib].

18. in the city of Aridi, the tribute of the Hargæans, the Harmasæans, ¹⁸the
 19. Simesæns, the Simeræans, the Sirisians, the Ulmanians, horses trained* to
 20. the yoke, oxen, sheep, wine I received. From the city of Aridi ¹⁹I departed.
 Steep roads and difficult mountains, which like the point of an iron dagger
 21. raised their peaks to the skies, with hatchets of bronze (and) copper I broke
 22. down. Chariots (and) ²⁰forces I brought through. To the city of Hupuskia I
 advanced. The city of Hupuskia together with one hundred bordering towns
 23. I burned with fire. Kakia, ²¹the king of the land of Na'iri, and the remainder
 of his troops before the brilliancy of my weapons became afraid and betook
 24. themselves† to the mighty mountains. After them to the mountains I
 25. ascended. ²²A great battle in the midst of the mountain I fought. Their
 overthrow I accomplished. Chariots, forces, horses trained to the yoke out of
 26. the mountain I brought back. The fear of the splendor ²³of Ašur, my lord,
 overwhelmed them; they descended and laid hold of my feet.‡ Taxes and
 27. tribute I laid upon them. From the city of Hupuskia I departed. ²⁴To the
 city of Sugunia, the stronghold of Aramu of the land of Urartu, I advanced;
 28. the city I besieged, I took. Many of their warriors I slew. ²⁵His spoil I
 carried off. A column of heads at the entrance of his city I fixed together.
 Fourteen of its neighboring towns I burnt with fire. From the city of Sugu-
 29. nia I departed. ²⁶To the sea of the land of Na'iri I descended. My weapons
 in the sea I washed. Offerings to my gods I sacrificed. In those days ²⁷I
 made a life-size image of myself; the glory of Ašur, the great lord, my lord,
 and the might of my power, I wrote upon it and placed it above the sea. On
 30. my return ²⁸from the sea, tribute from Asû of the land of Gozan, horses,
 31. oxen, sheep, wine, two dromedaries, I received; ²⁹to my city Aššur, I brought
 (them). In the month of Iyyar, the 13th day, I departed from Nineveh, I
 crossed the Tigris, the mountain of Hasamu, the mountain Dihnunu, I
 32. passed over. To the city of ³⁰Lâ'lâ'tû which belonged to Ahuni, the son of
 Adini, I approached. The fear of the splendor of Ašur my lord overwhelmed
 33. them. To (the mountains etc.?) they went. ³¹The city I destroyed (and)
 devastated. With fire I burnt it. From the city of Lâ'lâ'tû I departed. To
 34. (the city of Kiraka, the city) of ³²Ahuni, the son of Adini, I advanced. Ahuni,
 the son of Adini, trusted to the multitude of his forces, and to offer engage-
 35. ment and battle (he advanced against me). With the help of Ašur ³³and the
 great gods, my lords, I fought with him. His overthrow I accomplished. In
 36. his city I shut him in. From the city Kiraka? I departed. ³⁴To the city of
 Burmar'ana, belonging to Ahuni, the son of Adini, (I went. The city) I be-
 sieged, I took. Three hundred of their fighting men I brought down with my
 37. weapons. A column of heads ³⁵(at the entrance of his city I fixed together).
 . . . Tribute of Hapini of the city of Tilabnâ, of Gâ'uni of the city of
 38. Sa-ru? . . . a? Giri-Ramman ³⁶silver, gold,
 oxen, sheep, wine I received. From the city of Burmar'ana I departed. In
 39. ships of lamb-skins ³⁷I crossed the Euphrates. Tribute from Katazilu of the
 land of Kumuhu, silver, gold, oxen, sheep, wine I received. To the land of

* Span of the yoke.

† Lit., took the mighty mountains.

‡ = did me obeisance.

38. âlâni ša m. A-ḥu-ni apal A-di-ni ša šêpâ am-ma-tê ša nâru Purâtu ak-tê-rib a-bi-ik-ti mâti aš-kun âlâni-šu na-mu-ta
39. ú-ša-lik abikta ku-ra-dê-šu šêru rap-šú ú-mal-li I M. III C šâbê ti-du-ki-šu-nu ina kakki u-šam-kit⁵² (nothing wanting)
40. ištu¹⁸⁹ âlu Pa-kar-ru-uḥ-bu-ni at-tu-muš a-na âlâ-ni ša m. Mu-tal-li âlu Gam-gu-ma-a-a ak-tê-rib ma-da-tu
41. ša m. Mu-tal-li âlu Gam-gu-ma-a-a^a kaspâ ḥurâša alpê šêni karânê mârat-su⁵³ iš-tu nu-du-ni⁵⁴ ša ma-'a-di [am]-ḥur ištu âlu Gam-gu-mê
42. at-tu-muš ana âlu Lu-ti-bu âl dan-nu-ti-šu ša m. Ha-a-ni mâtu Sa-am-'a-la-a-a ak-tê-rib m. Ha-a-nu mâtu Sa-am^{54a} 'a-[la-a]-a m. Sa-pa-lu-ul-mê
43. mâtu Pa-ti-na-a-a m. A-ḥu-ni apal A-di-ni m. Sa-an-ga-ra mâtu Gar-ga-miš-a-a-na ri-šu-ut⁵⁵ 56a-ḥa-mêš [it-]tak-lu-ma ik-šu-ru
44. taḥâza a-na ê-piš êtêku^{56a} ma^{56b} a-na irti-ia it-bu-ni ina idâti ši-ra-a⁵⁷-ti ša ilu Urugallu a-lik pâni-ia ina kakkê êz-zu⁵⁸-tê.
45. ša Ašûr bêlu iš-ru-ka it-tê-šu-nu am-daḥ-ḥi-iš a-bi-ik-ta-šu-nu aš-kun mun-daḥ-ḥi-ši-šu-[nu⁵⁹]
46. ina kakkê u-šam-kit kîma ilu Rammân êlî-šu-nu ri-ḥi-il-ta u-ša-az-nin⁶⁰ ina ḥi-ri-šê at-bu-uk-šu-nu šal-mat
47. ku-ra-di-šu-nu šêru rap-šú ú-mal-li dâmê-šu-nu kîma na-pa-si šada-a aš-ru-up narkabâtê^{60a} [ma]-'a-tu sîsê
48. šimd-at nîri-šu ê-kim-šu a-si-tu ša kakkadê ina pu-ut âli-šu ar-šip âlâni-šu ab-bul ak-ḥur ina isâti [aš-ru⁶¹]-up
49. ina û-mê-šû-ma ad-lu-ul nar-bu-ut ilâni rabûtê ša Ašûr u ilu Ša-maš kur-di-šu-nu ú-ša-pa ana ša-a-tê ša-lam šarru-ti-ia
50. šur-ba-a êpu-uš il-ka-kat kur-di-ia êp-šit ur-nin⁶²-ti-ia ina ki-rib-šu al-ṭur ina rêš ê-ni nâru Sa-lu-a-ra
51. ša šêpu šadê-ê mâtu Ḥa-ma-ni ú-sê-ziz iš-tu mâtu Ḥa-ma-ni at-tu-muš nâru A-ra-an-tu ê-tê-bir a-na âlu A-li-šir(muš)
52. âl dan-nu-ti-šú ša m. Sa-pa-lu-ul-mê mâtu Pa-ti-na-a-a ak-tê-rib m. Sa-pa-lu-ul-mê âlu Pa-ti-na-a-a a-na šu-zu-ub⁶³
53. napšâtê-šu m. A-ḥu-ni apal A-di-ni m. Sa-ga-ra âlu Gar-ga-miš-a-a m. Ha-a-a-nu mâtu Sa-ma-'a-la-a-a m. Ka-tê-šu⁶⁵ ?⁶⁶
54. mâtû Ku-ú-a-a m. Pi-ḥi-ri(?)* mâtû Hi-lu-ka-a-a m. Bur-a-na-tê mâtû Ja-as-bu-ka-a-a m. A-da(?)⁶⁷ (the last three signs very doubtful)

COL. II.

1. ka-a
2. u-pâr-ri-ir âla a-si-bi ak-ta-[šad]
3. . narkabâtê⁶⁸-šu ma'adu sîsê šimd⁶⁹-at nîri-šu . . . [aš]-lu-la [dîkta-šu ma'adu]
4. [ina] kakkê u-šam-kit ina ki-rib tam-ḥa-ri šú-a-ti m. Bur-a-na-tê [mâtû Ja-as-bu-ka-a-a]

* Not legible.

38. (Pakaru)ḥbuni, ³⁸the cities of Aḥuni, the son of Adini, on the farther side of the Euphrates, I approached. The overthrow of the land I accomplished.
39. The cities ³⁹I turned to destruction, (with) the overthrow of his soldiers (brave ones) I filled the wide district. One thousand and three hundred of his warriors with the weapons I brought low. ⁴⁰From the city of Pakaruhbuni I
41. departed, to the cities of Mutalli the Gamgumian I advanced. Tribute ⁴¹from Mutallu the Gamgumian, silver, gold, oxen, sheep, wine, his daughter with her
42. large dowry, I received. From the city of Gamgumê ⁴²I departed. To the city of Lutibu, the stronghold of Hânu, the Samalæan I advanced. Hânu
43. the Samâ'æan, Sapalulme, ⁴³the Patinær, Aḥuni, the son of Adini, Sangara the Carchemisian, trusted to their reciprocal aid, and collected together.
44. ⁴⁴Battle to make they advanced, and came up before me (lit., to my breast). In the exalted power of Nergal, who goes before me, with the strong weapons
45. which ⁴⁵Ašur, the lord, presented, I fought with them; their overthrow I
46. accomplished; their fighting men ⁴⁶with the weapons I brought low. Like the god Ramman, over them I caused to pour an inundation. Into
47. the ditches (of the city) I cast them. ⁴⁷The corpses of their warriors I caused to fill the wide field. With their blood like wool I colored the
48. mountain. Many of their chariots, horses ⁴⁸trained to the yoke I took from him. A column of heads at the entrance of his city I fixed together. His
49. cities I destroyed, I devastated, I burnt with fire. ⁴⁹In those days I was obedient to the will (lit. greatness) of the great gods in causing the bravery† of Ašur and Šamas to shine for future (days). A sovereign image of great
50. size I made. The course of my bravery, the deeds of my power, I wrote upon
51. it. At the head source of the river Saluara, ⁵¹which is at the foot of the mountain of the land of Hamani, I erected (it). From the land of Hamani I departed. The river Orontes I crossed. To the city of Alisir (muš), the stronghold of Sapalulmu, the Patinian, I advanced. Sapalulmu, the Patinian
53. to save ⁵³his life,‡ Aḥuni the son of Adini, Sagara the Carchemisian, Hânu the Samâ'æan Katâšu? the Kûcan Piḥiri, the Cilician Burânatâ, the Jasbukean Ada?

COL. II.

1. ka
2. I broke, the city I besieged, I took
3. his chariots many, horses trained to the yoke I carried off.
4. (His many warriors) ⁴with the weapons I brought low. In the same battle

* Power.

† Lit. *lives*.‡ *Sagara*. Probably the same as Saugara, I. 43; II. 19, 27, 82.

5. ka-a-ti lu ik-šú-du ^{alu} ma-ḥa-zê rabûtê ša ^{alu} Pa-ti-na-a-a ?⁷⁰ . . .
6. ê-li-ni-tê ša ^{mātu} A-ḥar-ri u ? tâm-di DUP* ^{ilu} Šam-ši kîma ti-lu a-bu-bê lu aš-ḥu⁷¹-[up-šu-nu-ti]
7. ma-da-tu ša šarrâ-ni ša a-ḥat tâm-di am-ḥur ina a-ḥat tâm-di ra-pa-aš-tê mê⁷²-šê-rîš šal-tê-iš
8. lu at-ta¹⁸⁹-lak ša-lam bêlu-ti-ia mu-kin šumi-ia a-na da-ra-a-ti êpu-uš ina êlî tâm-di u⁷³-[šê-ziz]
9. a-na šadê-ê ^{mātu} Ha-ma-ni ê-li ^{isu} ga-šu-rê ^{isu} ê-ri-ni ^{isu} bu-ra-šê⁷⁴ a⁷⁵-kis a-na šadê-ê
10. ^{mātu} A-ta-lu-ur a-šar šalmu ša Ašûr-ir-bi zak-pu a-lik šalma itti⁷⁶ šalmi-šu u-šê-ziz ištu tâm-di at-tar⁷⁻⁷[rad]
11. ^{alu} Ta-ia-a⁷⁸ ^{alu} Ha-za-zu ^{alu} Nu-li-a ^{alu} Bu-ta-a-mu ša m. Pa-ti-na-a-a akšu-ud MM.DCCC. dikta-šu-nu
12. a-dûk XIV M.VI C šal-⁷⁹-la-su-nu aš-lu-la ma-da-tu ša m. A-ra-mê apal Gu-si kaspâ ḥurâša alpê
13. šêni karânê ^{isu}⁸⁰ iršu ḥurâšu ka-sap amḥur. Ina li-mê šatti šumi-ia ina⁸¹ arah Airi ûm XIII ištu ^{alu} [Ni-nu-a]
14. at-tu-muš nâru Idiklat ê-tê-bir šadû Ha-sa-mu šadû Di-iḥ-nu-nu at-ta-bal-kat a-na ^{alu} Til-bur[si-ip] âl dan-nu-[ti-šu† ša] m. A-ḥu-[ni]
15. apal A-di-ni ak-tê-rib m. A-ḥ[u-ni ap]al A-di-ni a-na gi-bîš ummânâtê-šu it-ta-kil-ma a-na irti-ia it-[ba a-bi]-ik-ta-šú aš-kun ina [âli-šu]
16. ê-sir-šu ištu ^{alu} Til-bur-si-ip at-tu-muš ina êlippê ša mašak taḥ-ši-ê nâru Purâtu ina me-li¹⁸⁹-ša ê-tê-bir ^{alu} . . . a?-ga-a ^{alu} Ta-gi . . .
17. ^{alu} Su-ú-ru-nu ^{alu} Pa-ri-pa ^{alu} Til⁸²-ba-šê-ri-ê ^{alu} Da-bi-gu VI âlâni-šu dan-nu-ti ša m. A-ḥu-ni apal A-di-ni [lu] ak-ta-šad dikta-šu
18. ma'adu a-dûk šal-la-su-nu aš-lu-la II C âlâni ša li-mê-tu-šu-nu ab-bul ak-ḥur ina ištâti aš-ru-up ana ^{alu} Da-bi-gi-i
19. ana ^{alu} Sa-za-bi-ê âl dan-nu-ti-šu ša¹⁸⁹ m. Sa-an-ga-ra¹⁸⁹ ^{alu} Gar-ga-miš-a-a ak-tê-rib âla a-si-bi ak[ta-šad] dikta-šu-nu ma'adu a-dûk
20. šal-la-su-nu aš-lu-la âlâ-ni ša li-mê-tu-šu ab-bul ak-ḥur ina ištâti aš-ru-up šarrâ-ni ša ^{mātu} ana si-ḥir-ti-šu-nu
21. ištu pân na-mur-rat kakkê-ia dan-nu-ti u taḥâzi-ia šit-mu-ri ip-laḥ-ú-ma šêpê-ia iṣ-ba-tu⁸³ m. un ša⁸⁴ ^{mātu} Pa-ti-na-a-a
22. III Gun ḥurâši I C Gun kaspi III C Gun siparri III C Gun parzilli I M diḫârê siparri I M. ^{ku}lu-búl-[ti bir-mê ^{ku}⁸⁵]kitû mârât-su
23. it-ti nu-du-ni-ša ma'adi XXX Gun ^{šig} argamâni D alpê V M. šêni am-ḥur-šú I Gun kaspi II Gun argamâni ?C ^{isu} gašurê ^{isu} ê-šu^{86†}-ni
24. ma-da-tu ina êlî-šu aš-kun šatti-šam-ma ina âli-ia Aššûr am-da-ḥar m. Ha-ia-a-na apal Gab-ba-ri ša šêpu šadû Ha-ma-ni X Gun kaspi XC (or XXX)? Gun

* Perhaps 6rib. † II. 19. ‡ Šu instead of ri is probably a mistake of the scribe.

5. Burânatê [the Jasbukean] my hand took (captive). ⁵The great cities of the
6. Patinians . . . upper (cities) of Phœnicia and ? the sea of the setting ?
sun, like the ruins of a deluge, I destroyed them (lit., I cast them down). The
7. tribute of the kings on the coast I received. On the coast of the broad sea
8. (Mediterranean) upright and triumphant ⁸I marched. A royal* image, the
preserver of my name forever, I made. Above the sea I (erected it). To the
9. mountains of Hamani I went up. Beams of cedar wood, cypress wood, I cut
10. down. To the mountains ¹⁰of the land of Atalur, where an image of Ašur-irbi
was erected, I went. An image with his image I erected. From the sea I
11. descended. ¹¹The city of Tajâ, the city of Hazazu, the city of Nulia, the city
of Butamu of the Patinians, I took. Two thousand, eight hundred of their
12. warriors ¹²I killed. Fourteen thousand, six hundred of their prisoners I
13. carried off. Tribute from Aramu, the son of Gusi, silver, gold, oxen, ¹³sheep,
wine, a bed of gold and silver I received. During the archonship of the year
14. of my name, in the month of Iyyar, on the 13th day, ¹⁴I departed from Nine-
veh; I crossed the Tigris (and) passed through the land of Diĥnunu. To the
15. city of Tilbarsip, the stronghold of Ahuni, ¹⁵the son of Adini, I advanced.
Ahuni, the son of Adini, trusted to the number of his forces and advanced
16. against me. I accomplished his overthrow. In (his city) ¹⁶I shut him. From
Tilbarsip I departed. In ships of lamb-skins I crossed the Euphrates during
17. high water. The city of . . . agâ?, the city of Ta-gi . . . ¹⁷the city of
Sûrumu, the city of Paripa, the city of Til-bašêrê, the city of Dabigu, six
18. strongholds of Ahuni, the son of Adini, I took. Many ¹⁸of his warriors I
killed; their booty I carried off. Two hundred neighboring towns I destroyed,
19. devastated (and) burnt with fire. To the city of Dabigu, ¹⁹to the city of
Sa-za-bû, the stronghold of Sangara, the Carchemisian, I advanced. The city
20. I besieged (and) took. Their many warriors I killed. ²⁰Their booty I carried
off. The neighboring cities I destroyed, devastated (and) burned with fire.
21. The kings of the land of . . . all about,‡ before the brilliancy of my
powerful weapons and my raging battle became terrified, and embraced‡ my
22. feet. . . . un from the land of Patina, ²²three talents of gold,‡ three
talents of silver, three talents of copper, three hundred talents of iron, one
thousand vessels of copper, one thousand (pieces) of variegated cloth, linen,
23. his daughter ²³with her large dowry, twenty talents of purple cloth, five
hundred oxen, five hundred sheep I received from him. One talent of silver,
24. two talents of purple cloth, x hundred beams of cedar, ²⁴as tribute I laid upon
him. Every year in my city Asur I received (it). Hajânu, the son of Gabaru,
at the foot of mount Hamanu, x talents of silver, (90 ? 3 ?) talents of gold,

* Lit., "image of my rule."

† Lit. "according to their circumference."

‡ took.

§ According to present value of gold, a talent would be equal to about \$32,400.00.

25. siparri XXX⁸⁷ Gun parzilli III C. ^{ku} lu-bul-ti bir-mê kitû III C al-pê III M. šêni II C ^{işu} ga-šu-rê ^{işu} ê-ri-ni⁸⁸ II X* Bêpl. ^{işu} ê-ri-ni
26. mârât-su it-ti nu-du-ni-ša am-ḥur-šú X ma-na kaspi I C⁸⁹ ^{işu} gašurê ^{işu} ê-ri-ni C⁹⁰ X*—Bê-pl. ^{işu} ê-ri-ni ma-da-tu ina êlî-šú⁹¹ aš-kun šatti-šam-ma
27. am-da-ḥar m. A-ra-mu apal A-gu-si X ma-na ḥurâši VI Gun kaspi D alpê v M. šêni am-ḥur-šú m. Sa-an-ḡa-ra ^{alu} Gar-ga-miš III⁹² Gun
28. ḥurâši LXX Gun kaspi XXX Gun siparri C Gun parzilli XX Gun ^{šiq} arga-mânu D⁹³ ^{işu} Kakkê mârât-su it-ti nu-du-ni ũ C mârâtê rabûtê-šu
29. D alpê⁹⁴ v M. šêni am-ḥur-šú LX ma-na ḥurâši I Gun kaspi II Gun ^{šig} arga-mâni ina êlî-šu aš-kun šatti-šam-ma am-da-ḥar-šú m. Ka-ta-zi-lu
30. mâtu Ku-mu-ḡa-a-a XX ma-na kaspi III. C ^{işu} gašurê ê-ri-ni šatti-šam-ma am-da-ḥar. Ina li-mê m. Ašûr-bêl-ka-in ina⁹⁵ araḡ Dû⁹⁶zi? ũm XIII ištu ^{alu} Ninua at-tu-muš
31. nâru Idiklat ê-tê-bir šadû Ḥa-sa-mu šadû Di-iḡ-nu-nu-nu at-ta-bal-kat ana ^{alu} Til-bar-si-ip âl dan-nu-ti-šu ša m. A-ḡu-ni apal A-di-ni ak-ta-šad m. A-ḡu-ni
32. apal A-di-ni ištu pân na-mur-rat kakkê-ia iz-zu-tê u taḡâzi-ia šit-mu-ri a-na šu-zu-ub napšâte-šu [ina mê-li]-ša nâru Purâtu ê-bir
33. a-na mâtâtê ša-ni-a-ti ib-bal-kit ina ḡi-bit Ašûr bêli rabî bê⁹⁷li-ia ^{alu} Til-bar-si-ip ^{alu} A-li-¹⁸⁹ gu . . . 10 cm. . . ša-gu-ḡa a-na ^{alu} šarrûti-ia
34. aš-bat amêlê amêlu Aš-šú-ra-a-a ina lib-bi u šê-šib êkallâtê a-na šú-bat šarrûti ia ina ki-rib-šu ad-di ^{alu} Til-bar-si-[ip] ^{alu} Kar-Šulmân-ašarêd
35. šum ^{alu} Nap-pi-gi ^{alu} Li-ta-Ašûr šum ^{alu} Al-li-gi ^{alu} Aš-bat?la-ku-na šum ^{alu} Ru-gu-li-¹⁸⁹ti ^{alu} Ku(Dur)-bi-it(d) [⁹⁹šumê]-šu-nu ab-bi ina ũmi-šu-ma
36. a-na ^{alu} Ašûr-u-tir-aš-bat šá¹⁸⁹ amêlê mâtu Ḥat-ta-a-a ^{alu} Pi¹⁰⁰-it-ru i-ḡa-bu-šu-ni šá¹⁸⁹ êlî nâru Sa-gu-[ra] šá šêpa-am-ma ša nâru Purâti
37. ũ ^{alu} Mu-ut-ki-i-nu šá¹⁸⁹ šêpa? an-na-tê šá nâru Purâtu šá m. Tukulti-pal-êšar-ra âbû rubu-ú âlik pâni-ia u-ša-[aš¹⁰¹-bi?]-tu] ina tar¹⁰²-ši¹⁰³ m. Ašûr-kirbi¹⁰³?
38. šar mâtu Aššûr šar mâtu A-ra-mu ina da-na-ni ê-ki-mu-ni âlâ-ni šú-nu-ti a-na aš-ri-šu-nu ú-tê-ra mârê amêlu Aš-šu-ra-a-a ina lib-bi ú-šê-šib.
39. Ki-i ina ^{alu} Kar-Šulman-ašarêd us-ba-ku-ni ma-da-tú ša šarrâ-ni ša a-[ḡat] tâm-di ũ šarrâ-ni ša a-ḡat nâru Purâti kaspi ḡurâša anâku^{pl.} siparra
40. diḡârê siparri parzillu^{pl. 105} alpê šêni ^{ku.} lu-bul-ti bir-mê u ^{ku.} kitû^{pl.} am-ḡur ištu ^{alu} Kar-Šulmanu-ašarêd at-tu-muš šadû Su-mu¹⁰⁶ at-ta-bal-kat
41. a-na mâtu Bit-za-ma-ni at-ta-rad ištu¹⁸⁹ mâtu¹⁰⁷ Bit-za-ma-a-ni at-tu-muš šadû Na-am-da-nu šadû Mê-ir-?-¹⁰⁸su a-ta-bal-kat ar-ḡê pa-aš-ḡu-tê šadê-ê
42. mar-šu-ti ša kîma šê-lu-ut paṡri a-na šamê-ê zi-ḡip-ta iḡku-nu ina ag-gul-lat êrê aḡ-ḡur¹⁰⁹ narkabâtê ummânâtê ú-šê-tiḡ a-na mâtu En-zi-tê šá¹⁸⁹ mâtu Išú-a

* See correction 90 for the representation of this sign, the syllabic value of which is not known. See also note.

¹⁰⁹ Nor. Lex. 154, correct.

25. ²⁵thirty talents of copper, thirty talents of iron, three hundred (pieces) of variegated cloth, linen, three hundred oxen, three thousand sheep, two hundred beams of cedar, two X-Bê of cedar, ²⁶his daughter with her large dowry I received from him. Ten mana of silver, one hundred beams of cedar, one hundred? X-Be. of cedar as tribute I laid upon him. Every year in my city
27. Ašur ²⁷I received it. Aramu, the son of Agusu, ten mana of gold, six talents of silver, five hundred oxen, five thousand sheep, I received of him. Sangara
28. of the city of Carchemish, three talents of ²⁸gold, seventy talents of silver, thirty talents of copper, one hundred talents of iron, twenty talents of variegated cloth, five hundred weapons, his daughter with dowry, and one hundred
29. daughters of his nobles, ²⁹five hundred oxen, five thousand sheep I received from him. Sixty mana of gold, one talent of silver, two talents of variegated cloth, I laid upon him. Every year I received (it) from him. Katazilu, ³⁰the
30. Kumuhian, twenty mana of silver, three hundred beams of cedar, every year I received (of him)—In the archonship of Asurbêlkain, in the month of Tammuz, on the 13th day, I departed from the city of Nineveh. ³¹The river Tigris I crossed, the mountain of Hasamu, the mountain of Diġnunu, I traversed. To the city of Tilbarsip, the stronghold of Ahuni, the son of Adini, I came.
31. Ahuni, ³²the son of Adini, before the brilliancy of my mighty weapons and my raging battle, to save his life, during high water, crossed the river
32. Euphrates. ³³To other lands he crossed through. By command of Ašur the great lord, the city of Tilbarsip, the city of Aligu . . . (city of) Sagukka
33. to my royal city I brought. ³⁴The men of* Assyria within (it), I settled. Palaces, for my royal residence in its midst I built. The city of Tilbarsip, Kar-Salmaneser, the name of the city Nappigi, Lita-Ašur, ³⁵the name of the city of Aligu, Azbat(?)lâkuna, the name of the city Ruguliti, Ku(dur)bit(?) their
34. names I called.—In those days also, ³⁶to the city of Ašur-utir-ašbat which the men of the land of Chatti call the city of Pêthor, which is above the river
35. Sâgûr, beyond the river Euphrates, ³⁷and the city of Mutkinu which is on this side of the Euphrates which Tiglathpileser, the father who was (went)
36. before me, had violently taken, (which) in the time of Asurkirbi(?) ³⁸the king of the land of Assyria(?) the king of Aram (Mesopotamia)† had by force taken away; these same cities I restored to their place. The sons of Assyria
37. (i. e. Assyrians) I settled within (them). ³⁹While I was quartered in the city of Kar-Salmaneser, the tribute of the kings of the sea-coast, and the kings
38. along the shores of the Euphrates, silver, gold, lead, copper, ⁴⁰vessels of copper and iron, oxen, sheep, variegated cloth and linen I received. From the city of Kar-Salmaneser I departed, the mountain of Sumu I crossed over.
39. ⁴¹To the land of Bit-Zamâni I descended. From the land of Bit-Zamâni I departed. The mountain of Namdanu, the mountain Mêirsu I crossed. Declivitous roads and ⁴²difficult mountains, which like the point of a dagger raised (made) their peaks to the skies, with hatchets of bronze I broke down. Chariots (and) forces I caused to go through (forward). To the land of

* Lit. "men, Assyrians."

† I. e., evidently an agreement had been made by which the king of Aram received it back again.

43. at-ta-rad mâtu Ên-zi-tê a-na si-hir-ti-ša kâtî ik-šu-du âlâ-ni-šu-nu ab-bul aḳ-kur ina iṣâti aš-ru-up šal-la¹¹⁰-su-nu bu-ša-šu-nu ŠA-GA-šu-nu a-na lá mē-ni
44. aš-lu-la ṣa-lam šarrû-ti-ia šur-ba-a êpu-uš ta-na-ti Ašûr bêli rabê bêli-ia u lê-ti kiš-šû-ti-ia ina ki-rib-šu al-ṭur âlu Sa-lu-ri-a šaplu^{111*} [šadû?]¹¹² Ki-ri-ê-ḳi ú-šê-ziz
45. Ištu mâtu Ên-zi-tê at-tu-muš nâru Ar-za-ni-a ê-tê-bir a-na mâtu Su-uḫ-mê a-na aḳ-tê-rib âlu Ú-aš-ta-al âl dan-nu-ti-šu ak-ta-šad [mātu][†] Su-uḫ-me a-na si-hir-ti-ša
46. ab-bul aḳ-kur ina iṣâti aš-ru-up m. Su-ú-a bêl âli-šu-nu ina kâ-ti aš-bat ištu mâtu Su-uḫ-mê at-tu-muš a¹¹³-na mâtu Da-ia-ê-ni a-ta-rad âlu Da-ia-e-ni
47. a-na si-hir-ti-ša ak-šud âlâ-ni-šu-nu ab-bul aḳ-kur ina iṣâti aš-ru-up šal-la-šu-nu bušâ-šu-na ŠA-GA ma-'a-du al-ḳa-a ištu mâtu Da-ia-e-ni at-tu-muš
48. a-na âlu Ar-za(ša)-aš-ku âl šarrû-ti-šu ša m. Ar-ra-mu âlu Ú-ra-ar-ṭa-a-a ištu pa-an na-mur-rat kakkê-ia† dannû-tê
49. u¹¹⁴ taḫâzi-ia šit-mu-ri ip-laḫ-ma âla-šu ú-maš-šir¹¹⁵ a-na šadê-ê mâtu Ad-du-ri ê-lî arka-šu a-na šadê-ê êlî taḫâzu dan-nu ina ki-rib šadê-ê aš-kun III M. IV C
50. mun-daḫ-ḫi-ṣi-šu ina kakkê u-šam-ḳit kîma ilu Rammân ina êlî-šu-nu ri-[ḫi-il]¹¹⁶-tu ú-ša-az-nin^{116‡} dâmê-šu-nu kîma na-pa-si [šadâ lú] aš-ru-up¹¹⁸ uš-ma-nu¹¹⁹-šu ê-ki-im-šú
51. narkabâtê-šu bit-ḫal¹²⁹-lu-šú sîsê¹⁸⁹-šu imêru pa-rê-šu a-ga-li ŠA-GA-šu šal-la-su bu-ša-šu ma-'a-du ištu ki-rib šadê-ê ú-tê-ra¹⁸⁹ m. Ar-ra¹⁸⁹-mu a-na šú-zu-ub
52. napsâtê-šu a-na šadê-ê mar-ši ê-li ina ki-šir zikrûti-ia mât-su kîma alpu rîmi¹²¹ a-di-iš âlâni-šu na-mu¹²²-ta ú-ša-lik âlu Ar-za(š)-aš-ku adî âlâ-ni
53. šá li¹⁸⁹-mê-tu-šú ab-bul [aḳ-kur ina iṣâti aš-ru-up] a-si-ti-a-tê šá¹²⁴ kaḳḳadê¹²⁵ ina pu-ut abulli-šu ar-šip ma'-(pl.)-tê ina lib-bi
54. || [a]n-nu-tê ina ba-tu [bat-tê-ša] a-si-ta-a-tê ina zi-ḳi-pê ú-za-ḳip ištu âlu Ar-za-aš-[ḳu] at-tu-muš a-na šadê-ê
55. [mātu Ê-ri-ti-a a-lik ṣa-lam šarrû]†-ti-ia šur-ba-a êpu-uš ta-na-ti [ša] Ašûr bêlu rabû¹²⁶ bêli-ia u lê-ti kiš-šû-ti-ia ša ina mâtu U-ra-[ar]ṭe ê-tap-pa-šú ina ki-rib-šu
56. [al¹²⁷-tur ina mâtu Ê-ri]**-ti-a ú-ša-zi-iz ištu mâtu E-ri-ti-a at-tu-[muš†† . . . âlu] A-ra-ma-li-ê aḳ-tê-rib âlâni-šu ab-bul aḳ-kur ina iṣâti aš-ru-up
57. ištu âlu A-ra-ma-li¹⁸⁹-ê at-tu-muš a-na âlu Za-an-zí-ú[aḳ¹²⁸-tê-rib . . .]†† ú ‡‡a-na taḫâ¹²⁹za ê-du-ur¹³⁰ šêpê-'a iṣ-bat

* "Ki-ta," not "ku-ta," as in R.

† "Mātu" probably omitted, occasioned by the preceding "šad."

‡ "ti" instead of plur. sign is probably an oversight.

§ Schrader's supposition (KGF. 132) correct.

|| Line 54 restored by reference to Asurnaz. I. 91.

† 18 cm. broken out.

** By Sayce and Schrader correctly restored.

†† Lacuna 14 cm.

‡‡ 16 cm. broken out.

§§ Cir. 12 cm. broken out, illegible, not as in R.

43. Enzite of the land of Isua ⁴³I descended. The land of Enzite in its whole extent my hands took. Their cities I destroyed (and) devastated (and) burnt
 44. with fire. Their spoil, their possessions and goods without number ⁴⁴I carried off. My royal image, of great size, I made. The excellence of Ašur, the great lord, my lord, and the might of my power I wrote upon it. (In) the city of
 45. Saluria at the foot of mount(?) Kirieki I erected it? ⁴⁵From the land of Enzite I departed. The river Arzania I crossed. To the land of Suḫmê I advanced. The city of Uaštāl, his stronghold, I took. (The land) of Suḫmê in its whole
 46. extent ⁴⁶I destroyed, devastated and burned with fire. Sûa, the governor of their cities, I took with my hand. From the land of Suḫme I departed. To
 47. the land of Dajaêni I descended. The city Dajaêni, ⁴⁷in its whole extent I conquered. Their cities I destroyed, devastated and burnt with fire. Their spoil and large possessions I took forth. From the land of Dajaêni I departed.
 48. To ⁴⁸the city of Arzašku, the royal city of Aramu, from the land of Urartai, I advanced. Arramu of the city of Urartai, before the brilliancy of my
 49. mighty weapons ⁴⁹and my raging battle became afraid. His city he abandoned (and) to the mountains of the land of Adduri he ascended. After him I ascended the mountains (and) a hard battle in the midst of the mountains I
 50. made. Three thousand four hundred ⁵⁰of his fighting men I brought low with the weapons. Like Ramman, over them an inundation I poured. With
 51. their blood, as with wool, I colored the mountain. His baggage I took from him. ⁵¹His chariots, his riding horses, his horses trained to the yoke, steers, calves, his goods, his spoil, his large possessions out of the midst of the moun-
 52. tains I brought back. Aramu, ⁵²to save his life betook himself to the difficult mountains. In the might of my manhood, his land, like a wild ox, I trod down, his cities I turned to destruction. The city of Arzašku together with
 53. ⁵³the neighboring cities I destroyed (devastated and burned with fire.) Columns of heads at the entrance of the city gate I fixed together
 54. some in the midst ⁵⁴ others round about the . . . columns on stakes I gibbeted. From the city of Arazašku I departed. To the mountains
 55. ⁵⁵(of the land of Eritia I went, my royal image) of great size I made. The excellence of Ašur, the great lord, my lord, and the might of my power, which
 56. in the land of Urartû I exercised, I wrote upon it. ⁵⁶In the land of Eritia I erected (it). From the land of Eritia I departed [. Against . . .
 . . . of the city] of Aramalu I approached. His cities I destroyed, devastated and burnt with fire. ⁵⁷From the city of Aramalu I departed. To the
 57. city of Zanzin I (advanced. Battle he avoided,

* Here evidently the name of the governor is omitted. See "Sûa" next line.

58. sîsê šimd-at nîre alpê šêni am-ḥur-šú rê-mu-tu aš-ku-na-aš[šu]
 -ia a-na tâm-di
59. šá mâtu Na-i-ri at-ta-rad kakkê Ašûr iz-zu-tê ina lib-bi tâm-di ú-lil* immêru¹³¹
 nikê [aḫ-ki ša-lam šarrû-ti-ia šur-ba-a]† êpu-uš ta-na-ti
60. Ašûr bêli rabî bêli-ia al-ka-kat ḫur-di-ia u êp-ši-ti ur-nin-ti-ia ina ki-rib-šu al-
 ṭur [ištu tâm-di] at-tu-muš a-na mâtu Gil-za-a-ni
61. aḫ-tê-rib m. A-sa-a-ú šar mâtu Gil-za-a-ni a-di aḫê¹³²-šu aplê-šu ina¹³³ irti-ia
 u-ša-ú¹³⁴ šarru?-ti? sîsê
62. šimd-at nîri alpê šêni karânê VII ud-ra-tê ša II gu-un-gu-li¹⁸⁹-pi-ši-na am-
 ḥur-šú ša-lam šarrû-ti-ia šur-ba-a êpu-uš ta-na-ti Ašûr bêli rabi-ê bêli-ia
63. u lê-ti kiš-šu-ti-ia šá ina mâtu Na-i-ri ê-tap-pa-aš ina ki-rib-šu al-ṭur ina ḫabal
 âli-šu ina ê-kur-ri-šu ú-šê-ziz ištu mâtu Gil-za-a-ni at-tu-muš
64. a-na âlu Ši-la-ia âl dannu-ti-šu ša m. Ka-a-ki šar âlu Hu-pu-uš-ki-a aḫ-tê-rib
 âla a-si-bi ak-ta-šad dikta-šu-nu ma'adu a-dûk III M. šal-la-su-nu alpê-šu-nu
65. šê-ni-šu-nu sîsê imêru pa-ri-ê a-ga-li a-na la mê-ni aš-lu-la a-na âli-ia Aššûr ub-
 la ina ni-ri-bê ša mâtu En-zi-tê êru-ub ina ni-ri-bê ša mâtu Kir-ru-ri¹³⁵
66. ina rêš âlu Arba'il ú-ši-a m. A-ḥu-ni apal A-di-ni šá¹⁸⁹ ištu¹⁸⁹ šarrâ-ni âbê-ia
 ši¹³⁶-ip-šu [u]¹³⁸ dan-na-ni¹³⁸ il-ta-kan-nu ina šur-rat šarrû-ti-ia ina li¹⁸⁹-mê
67. šanat šumi-ia-ma¹³⁹ ištu âlu Ninua at-tu-muš âlu Til-bur-si-ip âl dan-nu-ti-šu
 a-si-bi ḫu-ra-dê-ia† al-mê-šu mit-ḫu¹⁴⁰-šu¹⁴¹ inaḫ lib-bi-šu aš-kun
68. kirê-šu ak-ki-is nab-li mul-mu-li¹⁸⁹ êli-šu ú-ša-za-nin ištu pân na-mur-rat
 kakkê-ia mê⁶⁸-lam-mê¹⁴² [ša]|| bêlu-ti-ia ip-laḫ-ma âli-šu ú-maš-šir
69. a-na šú-zu-ub napîš-ti pl-šu nâru Purâtu ê-bir ina šani-tê šat-tê ina li¹⁸⁹-mê m.
 Ašûr-bân-a-a-ušur arki-šu ar-tê-di šadû Ši-i-ta-am-rat ubân šadê-ê ša a-ḫat
 nâru Purâtu
70. ša kîma irpitti ištu šamê-ê šu-ka-l-lu-la-at a-na dan-nu-ti-šu iš-kun ina ḫi-bit
 Ašûr bêli rabê bêli-ia u ihu Urugallu a-lik pâni-ia a-na šadû Ši-ta-am-rat aḫ-
 tê-rib
71. šá ina šarrâ-ni âbê-ia mu-um-ma ina ki-rib-šu¹⁴⁵ la iṭ-ḫu-ú ina III û-mê ḫar-
 ra-du šadu-ú i-ḫi-ṭa¹⁴⁶ ga-ab-šú libbi-šú tu-ḫu¹⁴⁷-um¹⁴⁸-ta ub-la ê-li ina šêpê-šu
 šadu-ú
72. u-saḫ-ḫi-ip m. A-ḥu-ni a-na rupuš?† ummânâtê-šu it-ta-kil-ma ina irti-ia ú-ša-a
 si-dir¹⁴⁹-tu lu-iš-kun kakkê Ašûr bêli-ia ina libbi-šu-nu ú-tar-ri-ši abikta-šu-nu
73. aš-kun ḫaḫkadê muḫ¹⁵⁰-tab-lê-šú ú-na-kis dâmê mun-daḫ-šê-šu šadu-ú aš-ru-up
 ma-a-du-ti-šu a-na ka-a-pi ša šadê-e i-ta-na-ḫu-tu-pi taḫâzu dan¹⁵⁷-nu ina
 libbi âli-šu
74. aš-kun pu-ul-ḫi mê-lam-mê ša Ašûr bêli-ia is-ḫu-pu-šu-nu ú-ri-du-ni šêpê-ia
 iṣ-bu-ú-tu m. A-ḥu-ni it-ti ummânâtê-šu narkabâtê bit-ḫal-lu-šú ŠA-GA
 êkal¹⁵²** li-ši-na ma-a-du

* Schrader corrected to "u-lil-lu ku."

† So to be restored! Cf. I. 50; II. 44, 55, 62.

‡ On the monolith 3 cm. broken out, probably before written upon.

§ Nothing wanting, as in R. ¶ Instead of "šur," R. ¶ Haupt, ASKT., pp. 24, 493. ** Cf. II. 89.

58. my feet he embraced. ⁵⁸Horses trained to the yoke, oxen, sheep I received from him. Favor I granted him (On my return), to the
59. sea of ⁵⁹the land of Na'iri I descended. The powerful weapons of Ašur I washed in the sea. Sacrifices (I offered. My royal image of great size) I
60. made. The excellence of Ašur, ⁶⁰the great lord, my lord, the course of my bravery and the deeds of my power, I wrote upon it. From the sea I departed.
61. To the land of Gozan ⁶¹I advanced. Asâu, the king of the land of Gozan together with his brothers, his sons, came forth against me (^{Battle I made}) . .
62. horses ⁶²trained to the yoke, oxen, sheep, wine, seven dromedaries, I received from him. My royal image, of great size I made. The excellence of Ašur the
63. great lord, my lord, ⁶³and the power of my might which I exercised in the land of Na'iri I wrote upon it. In the midst of his city within his temple I
64. erected. From the land of Gozan I departed. ⁶⁴To the city of Si-la-ja, the stronghold of Kâki, the king of Hupuškia, I advanced. The city I besieged, I took. Many of their warriors I killed. Three thousand prisoners, their
65. oxen, ⁶⁵their sheep, horses, steers, calves without number I carried off; to my city Aššur I brought (them). In the passes of the land of Enzitê I entered.
66. In the passes of the land of Kirruru ⁶⁶above the city of Arbêla I came out. Ahuni, the son of Adini, who since the kings, my fathers, supreme power and
67. might hath exercised, in the beginning of my rule, in the archonship of ⁶⁷the year of my name I departed from the city of Nineveh, the city of Tilbarsip, his stronghold, I besieged. In my strength I attacked it, and made battle
68. within it. ⁶⁸Its parks I cut down. The destruction of the javelins I poured out upon it. From before the brilliancy of my weapons, the splendor of my
69. lordship he became afraid; his city he abandoned. ⁶⁹To save his life he crossed the river Euphrates. In a second year, in the archonship of Ašur-banâuşur I pursued after him. The mount of Šitamrat, the top of the mount-
70. ain, (or = high m.) on the shore of the Euphrates, ⁷⁰which like a cloud from the skies hung down, he had made his stronghold. By command of Ašur, the great lord, my lord, and Nergal, who goes before me, to the mount of Ši-
71. tamrat I advanced, into whose midst, among the kings my fathers no one had approached, in three days the mighty mountains he saw; his strong heart
72. carried the war within, by foot he ascended, the mountain he destroyed. Ahuni trusted to his numerous forces and came forth before me. Battle array he made. The weapons of Ašur, my lord, I directed into their midst.
73. Their overthrow I ⁷³accomplished. The heads of his warriors I cut off, with the blood of his fighting men I colored the mountain. Many of his (lit. his
74. many) fled hurriedly to the rocks of the mountain. A hard battle ⁷⁴I made in the midst of his city. Fear before the splendor of Ašur, my lord, overcame them, they descended and embraced my feet. Ahuni, with his forces,

75. ša KI-LAL. šú la šab-ta-at a-na pāni-ia ú-tê-ra¹⁸⁹ nāru Idiklat ú-šê-bir a-na
 âli-ia Aššûr ub-la a-na nišê mâti-ia am-nu-šú-nu. Ina šatti-ma ši-a-ti a-na
 mâtu Ma-za-ma-a al-lik ina ni-ri-bi
76. ša mâtu Bu-na-is-lu êru-ub a-na¹⁵³ âlâ-ni ša m. Nik-di-mê m. Nik-di-ê-ra¹⁸⁹
 aḳ-tê-rib ištu pân na-mur-rat kakkê-ia dannûtê u taḥâzi-ia šit-mu-ri
 ip-la-ḥu-ma
77. ina êlippê iṣu ur-ba-tê a-na tâm-di it-tab-ku ina êlippê mašak taḥ-ši-ê arkatê
 šu-nu lu-aš-bat taḥâzu dan-nu ina ḳabal tâm-di lu êpu-uš abikta-šu-nu lu
 aš-kun
78. tâm-di ina¹⁵⁵ dâ-mê-šu-nu kîma na-pa-si lu aš-ru-up. Ina li-mê m. ilu Dân-Aššûr
 ina¹⁵⁶ arah Airi ûm XIV ištu âlu Ninua at-tu-muš nāru Idiklat ê-tê-bir a-na
 âlâ-ni
79. ša m. Gi-am-mu nāru Kaš-šat-a aḳ-tê-rib pul¹⁵⁷ ḥa-at bêlu-ti-ia na-mur-rat
 kakkê-ia iz-zu-tê ip-la-ḥu-ma ina kakki ra¹⁸⁹ ma-ni-šu-nu m. Gi-am-mu bêl-
 šu-nu
80. i-du-ku a-na âlu Kit-la-la u âlu Til-šá-tur-a-ḥi lu êru-ub ilâni-ia ana êkallâtê-šu
 lu ú-šê-ri-ib ta-ši-il-tu ina êkallâtê-šu lu aš-kun
81. na-kan-tê-šu¹⁵⁸ lu ap-ti ni-šir-tú-šú lu a-mur¹⁵⁹ ŠA-GA-šu bušâ-šu aš-lu-la a-na
 âli-ia Aššûr ub-la ištu âlu Kil-la-la at-tu-muš a-na âlu Kar-Šulmānu-ašarêd
82. aḳ-tê-rib ina êlippê mašak taḥ-ši-ê ša šanî-tê šanîti nāru Purâta ina mê-li¹⁸⁹ ša
 ê-bir ma-da¹⁸⁹ tu šá¹⁸⁹ šarrâni ša šêpa am-ma-tê šá¹⁸⁹ nāru Purâti ša¹⁶⁰ m.
 Sa-an-gar
83. âlu Gar-ga-miš-a-a ša m. Ku-un-da¹⁸⁹ aš-pi âlu Ku-mu-ḥa-a-a ša m. A-ra¹⁸⁹ mê
 apal Gu-si ša¹⁸⁹ m. Lal-li âlu Mê¹⁶¹ li-da-a-a ša m. Ha-ia-ni apal Ga-ba-ri
84. ša¹⁶² m. Kal-pa-ru-da mâtu Pa-ti-na-a-a ša m. Kal-pa-ru-da mâtu Gam-gu-
 ma¹⁶³ a-a kaspera ḥurâša anâkup¹ siparra diḳârê siparri
85. âlu (ina)¹⁶⁴ Aššûr-ut-tir-aš-bat ša šêpu am¹⁶⁵ têtê¹⁶⁶ ša nāru Purâtu ša êlî nāru Sa-
 gu-ri¹⁸⁹ ša amêlê¹⁶⁷ mâtu Hat-ta-a-a âlu Pi-it-ru
86. i-ḳa-bu-šu-ni ina lib-bi am-ḥur ištu êlî nāru Purâtu at-tu-muš a-na âlu Hal-
 man aḳ-tê-rib ta-ḥa-za ê-du-ru šêpê-ia¹⁶⁸ iṣ-bu-tú
87. kaspera ḥurâša ma-da-ta-šu-nu am-ḥur immêru níkê ana pân ilu Rammâni ša¹⁸⁹
 âlu Hal-man êpu-uš ištu âlu Hal-man at-tu-muš a-na¹⁶⁹ âlâ-ni
88. ša m. Ir-ḥu-li-ê-ni mâtu A-mat-a-a aḳ-tê-rib âlu A-di-ên-nu âlu Bar-ga-a âlu
 Ar-ga-na-a âl šarrû-ti-šu akšu-ud šal-la-su bušâ-šu
89. ŠA-GA êkallâtê-šu ú-šê-ša-a a-na êkallâtê-šu išâti ad-di¹⁷⁰ ištu âlu Ar-ga-
 na-a at-tu-muš a-na âlu Kar-ḳa¹⁸⁹ ra aḳ-tê-rib
90. âlu Kar-ḳa-ra âl šarrû-ti-šu¹⁷¹ ab-bul aḳ¹⁸⁹ ḳur ina išâti aš-ru-up i M. II C nar-
 kabâte i M. II C bit-ḥal-lu xx M. šâbê¹⁷² ša Hadad-'idri
91. [ša* mâtu] Imêri-šu VII C narkabâtê VII C bit-ḥal-lu x M. šâbê ša m. Ir-ḥu-
 li¹⁸⁹ ê-ni mâtu A-mat-a-a II M. narkabâtê x M. šâbê ša m. A-ḥa-ab-bu

¹⁶⁴ See corrections.

* Cf. Lay. Inscrip., p. 16, l. 44, "Hadadidri ša mât," etc.

¹⁶⁵ "am" doubtless omitted.

75. chariots, riding horses, goods of their palace, ⁷⁵whose weight was not taken, before me I brought back, caused to cross over the Euphrates (and) to my city Aššur I brought (them). To the inhabitants of my land I reckoned them.
76. In the same year to the land of Mazamua I went. In the pass ⁷⁶of the land of Bunaislu I entered; to the cities of Nikdimê, Nikdiêra I advanced. Before the brilliancy of my mighty weapons and my raging battle they became afraid
77. and ⁷⁷in ships of wickerwork (withes) they betook (turned) themselves to the sea. In ships of lamb-skins I followed them, (lit. took their rewards). A hard battle in the middle of the sea I made. Their overthrow I accomplished.
78. ⁷⁸The sea with their blood I colored as wool. In the archonship of Dânašur, in the month Ijjar, on the 14th day, I departed from the city of Ninêveh.
79. The Tigris I crossed (and) to the cities of Giammu on the river Kaššata I advanced. The fear of my dominion, the brilliancy of my mighty weapons filled them with fear (or terrified them). With their own weapon(s) they put
80. to death Giammu, their governor. To the city of Kitlala and Tilšaturâhi I entered. My gods I brought into his palace; a festival in the palace I made.
81. ⁸¹His store-house I opened, his treasures I saw, his possessions I carried off, to my city Aššur I brought (them). From the city of Kitlala I departed. To
82. the city Kar-Salmaneser ⁸²I advanced. In ships of lamb-skins the second time, the Euphrates, in high water, I crossed. The tribute of the kings
83. beyond the Euphrates, (viz.,) Sangar, the Charchemisian, Kundaspi, the Kumuhean, Arame, the son of Gusu, Lalli of Mytilene, Hajani, the son of
84. Gabaru, ⁸⁴Kalparuda, the Patinian, Kalparuda, the Gangumean, silver, gold,
85. lead, copper, copper vessels, in* ⁸⁵the city of Ašurûtirāšbat which is beyond the river Euphrates, which is above the river Saguri, which the Hittites† call
86. the city of Pêthor, within it, I received.‡ From above the river Euphrates I departed. To the city of Halman‡ I advanced, they avoided battle, they
87. embraced my feet. ⁸⁷Silver, gold, their tribute I received. Sacrifices to the god Ramman of the city of Halman I made. From the city of Halman I
88. departed. ⁸⁸To the cities of Irhuliêna of the land of Hamath, I advanced. The city of Adiênu, the city of Barga, the city of Arganâ, his royal city, I took.
89. His spoil, his possessions, ⁸⁹his goods I brought forth out of his palace (and) I set the palace on fire. From the city of Argana I departed. To the city of
90. Ẓarḳar I advanced. ⁹⁰The city of Ẓarḳar, his royal city, I destroyed, devastated (and) burnt with fire. One thousand two hundred chariots, one thou-

* See transcription and corrections. The writer changed the order evidently of "ina âli" to "âlu ina" by mistake.

† Lit. "men of the land of Chatti."

‡ Sentence complicated by the explanatory phrases: briefly = "I received the tribute of the kings beyond the Euphrates within the city Ašurûtirāšbat."

§ i. e., Aleppo. Del. PD. 275.

|| Nom. gentil:

92. mātu Sir-'a-la-a-a v C šâbê šá¹⁸⁹ mātu^{172a} Gu-a-a i M. šâbê ša mātu Mu-uš-ra¹⁸⁹-a-a
X narkabâtê x M. šâbê ša mātu Ir-ka-na-ta-a-a
93. II C šâbê ša m. Ma¹⁷³-ti-nu-ba-'a-li¹⁸⁹ âlu Ar-ma-da-a-a II C šâbê ša mātu Ú-sa-
na-ta-a-a XXX narkabâtê[?]¹⁷⁴ M. šâbê
94. ša m. A-du-nu-ba-'a-li¹⁸⁹ mātu Ši-a-¹⁷⁵na-a-a i M. imêru gam-ma-lu ša m. Gi-in-
di-bu-'a mātu Ar-^{ba}-a-a . . 8 cm. . ? M. šâbê
95. ša m. Ba-a'-sa apal Ru-^{hu}-bi mātu A-ma-na-a-a XII šarrâni an-nu-ti a-na nirâ-
rû-ti-šu il-ka-a a-na^{176,177} [ê-piš]
96. kabla u taḥâza ana irti-ia it-bu-ni ina idâti šîrâti šá¹⁸⁹ Ašûr bêlu iddi¹⁷⁷-na ina
kakkê dannûti ša ilu¹⁷⁸ Urugallu a-lik pâni-ia
97. iš-ru-ka it-ti-šu-nu am-daḥ-^{hi}-iṣ ištu ^{afu} Kar-ka-ra a-di âlu Gil-za-ú abik-ta-
šu-nu lu aš-kun XIV M. šâbê
98. ti¹⁷⁹-du-ki-šu-nu ina kakkê u-šam-^{kit} kîma ilu Rammân êlî-šu-nu ri-^{hi}-il-ta
ú-ša-az-nin¹⁸⁰ ú-ma¹⁸¹-ši¹⁸² šal¹⁸³-mat-šu-nu
99. pa-an na-mê-ê ú-šam-li¹⁸⁹ rapšâtê ummânâtê-šu-nu ina kakkê ú-šar-di dâmê-
šu-nu ḥar-pa-lu ša-na-gu?
100. i-mê-iṣ šêri ana še¹⁸⁴-tar¹⁸⁵ napšâtê-šu nap¹⁸⁶-ra-ru ú-rap¹⁸⁷-šu a-na du-pu-ri-
šu-nu aḥ(iḥ?)-li-iḥ ina *pagrâni-šu-nu¹⁸⁸
101. nâru A-ra¹⁸⁹-an-tu kîma¹⁸⁸ ti-i-ri ak-šud ina ki-rib tam-ḥa-ri šú-a-ti narkabâtê-
šu-nu bit-ḥal-la-šu-nu
102. sîsê-šu-nu šimd-at iṣu ni-ri-šu-nu ê-kim-šu-nu

* The sign "be" (mit) doubtless to be supplied after "amêlu." Three cm. are broken out.

91. sand two hundred riding horses, twenty thousand soldiers of Benhadad ⁹¹of
 Damascus, seven hundred chariots, seven hundred riding horses, ten thousand
 92. soldiers of Irhuliena of Hamath, two thousand chariots, ten thousand soldiers
 of Ahab ⁹²of Israel, five thousand soldiers of the Guians, one thousand sol-
 93. ⁹³two thousand soldiers of Matninbâ'al of the Arvadites, two hundred sol-
 94. diers of the Usanations, thirty chariots, ten* thousand soldiers of ⁹⁴Aduni-bâ'al
 of the Sianians, one thousand camels of Gindibû' of the Arbeans
 95. ten thousand soldiers ⁹⁵of Bâ'sa, the son of Ruḥribi, of the Amaneans (Am-
 96. monites?): these *twelve*† kings came to his aid. To make war⁶⁹ and battle
 they came forth before me. In the high power which Ašur the lord bestowed,
 97. with the powerful weapons which Nergal who goeth before me ⁹⁷presented, I
 fought with them. From the city of Karkar to the city of Gilzan I accom-
 98. plished their overthrow. Fourteen thousand ⁹⁸of their warriors with the
 weapons I brought low. Like the god Ramman upon them an inundation I
 99. poured out, (I) scattered their corpses. The ⁹⁹face of the plain I filled with
 their numerous troops. With the weapons I made their blood to flow over
 100. the extent of the field. To preserve their (his, its) lives they increased con-
 101. fusion (viz. by flight)? After them I rushed. Upon their dead bodies ¹⁰¹the
 river Orontes, like a bridge, I crossed.‡ In the same battle their chariots,
 their riding horses, their horses trained to the yoke, I took from them.

* Mon. 10 ? ? See cor.

† Only *eleven*!

‡ Might mean "arrive at." Kašâdu has both meanings of attain and overcome.

NOTES.

1. *ilu Anû šar*, etc.—Just as *Anu* is here mentioned as the king of the *Igigê* and *Anunnaki* do we find, II R. 66, No. 1, 5, *Bêltis* as the *uršânât Igigê*, i. e., the powerful (goddess) of the *Igigê*. Similarly, II R. 66, 3, *Bêltis* is the “*li’at Igigê*,” and I R. 9, 3, the god *Bêl* is the *šar gimir ilu Anunnaki*, i. e., “king of all the *Anunnaki*,” V R. 51, 27, *Merodach* is the “*pâkidu rabû ša Igigê*,” i. e., “*Merodach*, the great overseer (ruler) of the *Igigê*.” The rule over these spirits of the lower and upper regions seems thus not to have been the special prerogative of any one of the higher deities, but was exercised by all the higher determining deities, which, according to K. 4629, Str. 95, were *seven* in number: “*ilâni šûnâti sibittišunu*.” The same fragment mentions the “*ilâni rabûti*” (great gods) as five in number, “*hamšatšunu*.” The *Igigê* seem to be confined to the upper regions, whereas the *Anunnaki*, as appears from the above quoted fragment, are mentioned both of heaven, “*ša šamê*” (five in number) and of earth, “*ša iršiti*.”

mušîm.—II., שׂים I. to place, appoint; II. determine. *šîmâti* pl. of *šîmtu* lot, destiny. The same appellative is given to *Merodach*, I R. 67, I. 7.

2. *mûšîr*.—II., from אָצַר ? enclose, surround. Cf., for the form, *u-di-lu* from (אָדַל) *êdêlu* bolt, fasten, from which we have *mêdilum*, II R. 23, 34d; *mêdil*, IV R. 17, 8a, and *mêdilutum* (II R. 23, 22c, d) hinge.

êšûrât.—From the same stem and with the same meaning as *ušûrtu*, *Sarg. St. In.*, where we read, “*ša êpšit kâtî’a unakkaruma . . . ušûrât êšêru ušamsakûma*” *whoever the work of my hands changes, the boundaries I fixed removes*, etc. The same evil invocation occurs in the *Bronze Ins.*, but with *êšûrât* instead. The root-meaning of the word is “enclosure,” “bound” in general, and then more specifically, perhaps, “wall,” *Lyon*, “*Mauer*.” Cf. the phrase, V R. 65, 1, 7, where *Nabonidus* calls himself the “*muššîr (u)ššûrâti bitât ilâni*” *the one who built (enclosed) the walls of the temples*.

niklâtê.—Pl. from *nikiltu* cunning, craft, נִכְל; cf. Heb. נִכְל. Cf. with this line, and particularly for the restoration of *rabû niklâtê*, *Sarg. Cyl. 47*, “*ša ina kibîš šar apsê bêl nimêki tašimta zunnunûma malû niklâtê*” *which by order of the king of the abyss, the lord of wisdom, was made full of decision* (v. “*Proleg.*” v. 73). Here we have *malû* corresponding to the supplied “*rabû*,” and, at the same time confirmation of the correctness of the reading *nik-la-ti*.

ilu Na-nir.—With this reading one great difficulty of this inscription is removed. We have now the number of gods, seven, as is to be expected, and the unknown god (see No. a) of *Rawl.* disappears. It is another reading for the more commonly occurring appellative of the god *Sin*, viz., *Nannaru*, e. g., V R. 64, 1, 17; in the bilingual hymn in IV R. 9, etc., where it stands as an attribute of the god *Sin*. Here it stands alone for *Sin*. *Sm. As. 126, 8*: “*ilu Sin na-an-nir šamê u iršiti*.” *Lenorm.* “*Lettres Assy.*,” Tom. II., p. 123, we read the same word as in No. 6.

3. muštêšir.—III₂, from root ישר *to be straight*, III₂ rule.

mêlulta.—Fem. from root מלל; mêlultu *decision, command*; cf. Heb. מלל *to speak*. See also the same word I R. 7, IX. D., where Schrader reads mênarti; Sayce, mêlulti, but derives from אלל.

râ'imût.—For this writing of the sign râ'mu, see Asurn., I., 37, where both forms, given in No. c, are found.

4. šâpirûti.—See corrections and cf. Asurn., I., 42, " . . . ana pêli šuknušê u šapâri aggiš umâ'irûni," also l. 14 of Mon. below. Root שפר *to send, dispatch*, III. rule. Šâpirûtu here means "rule"* and the whole phrase seems to be best translated as I have given it. This translation rests upon a different reading from that in the text, viz., upon the reading muḥ-hur (instead of u na p-har) which seemed to me, when I copied it, the more natural decipherment of the remaining traces of the broken sign. The whole passage is exceedingly difficult; and as the reading of the above sign is doubtful, I avoid further comment. Sayce's translation, "who extend lordship over multitudes and union, the glory of my fame, empire, and all princes mightily have they made for me," seems to miss the sense entirely, and to overlook the derivation of the words as well as the grammatical construction.

5. Šulmânu-ašarêdu.—This reading rests on the writing of the name found in the Babylonian chronicle given by Mr. Pinches, PSBA. '84, 198, where the successor of Tiglath-pileser is given as Šul-man-a-ša-rid. See for detailed discussion Prof. Schrader's article in ZKF., II. Bd., 197 sqq., also ZA., Bd. I., p. 126 seq. The writing here is defective, probably owing to the scribe. The sign "di" = Šulmu, Sb. 186 (Del. ALss.), is here omitted; the full reading is found in Lay., 12:1, etc.

6. murtêdû.—Part. I₂ from root ררה, I. tread, march; I₂ go (for one's self); rule, govern. A frequent phrase. Cf. Sh. Phul, I R. 32, 28, "murtêdû kâliš mâtâtê."

ba'it.—Root בעה.

amêru.—Part. I. אמר *see, look*. Sayce translates "ruler of roads and lord of streets" here. It is simply a poetic use of the word "to see" in the sense of surmounting, overcoming. Cf. Khors. 15, where, speaking of the mountains, he (Sargon) says, "nêribšunu . . . upattîma âmura durugšun" *their entrances (or interior) I opened up and their paths I looked upon (saw)*. Oppert translates âmur falsely by "amovi."

7. i-gi-si-ê.—The meaning "tribute," "present," etc., seems clear from the parallel passages, in which mandattu occurs with biltu, or madattu =

* For the meaning of šapâru, apart from the argument from contexts, see ASKT. p. 15, No. 196. See d, = ša-pa-ru 195, = ta-a-ru, p. 23, 247. See e, = ta-a-ru, 473. See f, = ta-a-ru 474 = a-pa-lu = "subdue" (from which âpilu *master of the house*), and lastly V R. 39; 30 d, where the sign (which above = ta-a-ru = a-pa-lu) = 'ûrû *lead, guide*.

mandantu, from nadânu to give, e. g., l. 23, and repeatedly in Tig. I. The present phrase "bilti ũ igisê" occurs also in Salm. Ob. 106, where Salmaneser reports having received from twenty-four kings of the land of Tabali igišunu. In the inscription of Sh. Phul, I R. 32, 37, we have, "Salmaneser . . . mâr Ašûrnâširpal mâhir bilti u igisî ša kâliš kibrâtî." So also Nebuchad., I R. 60, 35 sqq., after narrating his capture of prisoners, his reception of gold, silver, pearls, palm and cedar wood, the product of mountain and sea, he adds, "ipti kabitti igisâ šummuḥu ana . . . Bâbili ušêrib" a rich gift, a magnificent (lit. *prosperous*, שׁמח thrive, prosper) present . . . In the parallel passage, Lay., 12, 3, below, we have, word for word, the same as here in lines 7 and 8; but there we have perhaps "ši + di" (see g.) instead of "igisê." Dr. H. Zimmern, in his excellent work "Babylonische Busspsalmen," etc., p. 105, 60, in arguing for the value "pik" for the sign (see i) refers to this passage and also to Mon. 1, 7, viz., the passage before us, where, he says, ši[pik] "wohl zu lesen ist." It will be seen by referring to "correction" number 9, that "ši" before ũ is erased, and, as I remember, quite deeply. That "ši" is erased is proof sufficient that no emendation is here admissible.*

8. mupattû.—Part. II. from פתח open. Cf. I R. 10, 86, "mupitti durug šadâni" opener of the road (through) mountains. Cf. II R. 22, for derivatives.

tûdâtê.—Pl. from tûdu way. Syn. of ḥarrânu and girru, according to K. 4195 (Prof. Del. Lect., W. S. '85). This word forms its pl. also tûdê, e. g., cf. Sanh. IV., 4, etc.

ultanapšaḳa = uštanapšaḳa (according to the rule of Assyrian pronunciation, the sibilant passes over into the liquid l before the dentals; cf. also riḫiltu = riḫištu heavy rain, deluge; altu for aštu = aššatu = anšatu, etc., etc.). Root פשק from which we have the adjectives pašḳu and šupšukū steep, difficult, etc. ultanapšaḳa is a Shafel (III.) reflexive form with "tan," Pres. pl. 3 f. To denote it as an "Iftaneal of the Shafel" is inexact (cf. Pognon, "L'inscription de Bav.," 204).

9. iḫîlû.—I. from חיל shake, tremble. From this root also comes the well-known ḥâlṭi Šintfluth, 124, ALs., "imtaḥṣu kîma ḥâltu." Cf. חולק, Jer. IV. 21.† See, now, Del. Proleg.

10. istamdaḥu.—ištamdaḥu = ištandaḥu = ištanádaḥu, from root שרח to go about, Is. Impf. 3 s. Note also the Inf. const. of the same form in I R. 46; IV, 59, "ana šitmur sîsê šitamduḥ narkabâtê" for the keeping of the horses, for the movement of the wagons. From this stem also comes mašdaḥu, syn. of sûḳu. V R. 8, 98.‡

* To be noted, however, in this question is IV R. 9, 36a, where, according to Hommel, ZKF. Bd. I. 168, "igi" was originally "igis" (?).

† See Halevy, ZKF., Bd. I. 262 seq.

‡ Cf. also Budge, Esarh. 116, II, "šadê maršûtê rêmâniš aštamdiḥ" difficult mountains like a wild bull I traversed.

12. kûn [libbi]-šu.—kûn: st. c. from kûnu *fixedness, fidelity*. In the sense of fixedness, durability, in frequent use, e. g., Neb. Borsip., I R. 51; II, 21, “kûn kussê labâri palê” *a stable (stability of) throne, long reign*. So also I R. 52, 4, 18, in a similar passage, “kûn kussi ũ labâr palê.” kûnu in sense of fidelity is of frequent occurrence with libbu *heart*, (see I R. 8, No. 6, 5); and consequently I have supplied libbi here, for which the break in the inscription offers about sufficient space. Cf. Asarh., I R. 47, VI, 32, “ilâni šâtunu ina kûn libbi-šunu iktârabû šarrûti'a” *the same gods in the fidelity of their heart favor my rule (sovereignty)*; Tig. I, VII, 46, “ša Ašûr . . . ina utât kûn libbišû ihšuhma ana rê'ût . . . ibbûšu.” Cf. also I R. 8, vi. 4 and 5, with this last, “^{du} zar-pa-ni-tum bi-bil ? ku-un libbi ^{du} Nabû u Marduk.”

12. uddâ.—Probably II. form from ידע (idû) *know, recognize*. uddâ would then equal the obsolete original *yujaddi'a, just as we have in the Shafel III. ušêšâ = jušêši'a from âšû (יצא), išmâ I. (שמע) = *jašmi'a *he heard*, etc., etc.

upirra.—See corrections. Assuming the correctness of my reading, this would seem to be an irregular II. form from apâru *to cover*. The regular form would be uppir, like uššib, from ašâbu. The form upirra would more naturally refer to a root pâru (פור). Such a root exists with the meaning “to be strong,” etc., from which we have pûru *wild ox*, and the fem. pûrtu; but this meaning does not suit in our passage, though the form could well be compared with upîra, like ukîn from kânu (כין). In Tig. I., col. I., 21, we read in a similar passage the pl. form of the II. form from apâru, “agâ šîra tupirrâšû ana šarrût mât Bêl rabêš tukînâšû.” The form, however, does not favor my reading. Notice, however, here the form êtabru for êtêbiru, Asum. III., 27.

14. Cf. here Asum. I., 42, “. . . . ħuršâni dannûtê ana pêli šuknušê u šapâri aggiš umâ'irani” *mighty mountains to overcome, to subject and to subdue, he sternly commanded me*.

aggiš.—Adverb, from a root אגג *be fierce, angry*.

umâ'iranni.—II. from אמר 3 s. m.

16. asibî.—From (שבה) šabû *oppress, attack, overcome*.

asibî = astibî = aštibî.—I. Prt. 1 s. The regular form would be aštabî, the vowel of the second syl. due to the final long “î” and the loss of the reflexive “t.” This, however, uncommon.

asîtu.—This word occurs in the singular in Col. I., ll. 25, 34, 48. The plural occurs twice, in lines 53 and 54 of Col. II., and in both as asîâtâtê. Another form is found in Asumaz., the sing., as isîtu (var. a), Col. I., 90 (isîtê, i. e., Genitive), and the pl., as isîâtâti, l. 109. The reading a-sa-ia-tê, I R. 14, 27, points to a long vowel in the second syllable. That the meaning “pillar,” “column” is approximately correct is not only clear from the context, but also from the passage in Tig. I. above, where the a-sa-ia-te of the great wall was built

of brick. Is the representation on the bronze gates of Balawat, wherein appear to be four upright posts, apparently quite a good deal larger, or at least as high, as a middle-sized man, upon which is represented ten heads, four to be seen on the two outside ones and one on each of the two in the middle (according to my own drawing), not instructive here? * These posts could easily be covered with the skins, as in the inscriptions it is narrated, and by the insertion of spikes the heads could be fastened on. Close to this representation on the bronze gates is another gibbeted with outstretched legs upon a slender pole (probably the "zakpu"); the hands and feet lie at the bottom. Asurnazirpal, I., 89, tells us that, having built an "asîtu," he flayed the insurrectionists and covered it with their skins; some he walled within it, some upon it he gibbeted, and with others (ina zikîpê) on gibbets (spikes) he surrounded the asîtu. These large posts, together with the heads, seem to me to be the asîâtâtê, the single spike-like stake on which the accompanying figure is gibbeted to the zakpu, and the board-like stick upon which victims were impaled with the head bent forward and the hands hanging down, the body being perforated from the abdomen, representations of which are to be seen in the British Museum, appears to me to be the gašîšu upon which the corpses were hung. Cf. V R. 9, 123, "pagrâni ina gašîši alul;" also V R. II. 3. In view of this representation, as well as the passages referred to, and others similar, where it is specifically said, "I hung their corpses upon gašîšê, Dr. Haupt's rendering of gašîšû as "boat-hook" does not appear to me tenable.

17. batûlu *young man*.—For the ideog. see V R. 42, 55, e, f, where "lû" is to be restored.

batûltu.—The fem. of batûlu. See line 56 of the same page, also line 61. Cf. Heb. בתולה.

maqlûtu.—From a root קלה *to burn*, with prefixed מ.

usbakûni.—Derivation uncertain. Schrader refers to צב.

18. šimdat.—Fem. const. from šimittu = šimidtu = *span*; from šamâdu *to span together*. The sign is = šamâdu (ASKT. 745), also = sarâdu. Cf. Sanh. v. 30, šindusu, and for the same writing as here, Asurn. III. 21, and also Sanh. Tayl. VI. 50, for the derivative našmadu. In II R. 27, 24, a, b, we have "šamâdu ša narkabtu." Cf. for the signs IS.IS the parallel II. 102, "šimdat nîrišunu," also Asurn. I. 86.

19. attumuš.—Pinches and others read attusir. But see the readings at-tum-ša, I R. 25, 101; 26, 109; 22, 91. In the latter at-tu (var. tum)-ša. Better derived from אמש *to break up*. Cf. Heb. אמש *evening*.

šêlût *point, top*.—Here st. c. fr. šêlûtu, אלה, with prefixed ש.

paṭri.—Gen. fr. paṭru *dagger*. פטר *split, open*.

* On another is a double row of heads eight in number.

šaknû.—Perm. I. 1, 3 pl., fr. šakânu.

agullat.—The sign given No. j is probably an ideog. for aggulatu. Cf. II. 42, where aggulat is phonetically written. As (see k.) ša = šiknu and (see l.) gul = Sb 338, abātu *destroy*, the two together could well mean “instrument of destruction.”

20. akṭêrib.—Impf. I. 1. s. from karâbu *approach*, with change of the reflexive “t” into “ṭ” (i. e. resp. ת and ט) after the ק.

21. namurrat.—St. c. from namûrratu, from stem נמר *to be bright, brilliant*. Of this, however, I am not certain. We find the writing, Bal. Gates, Col. III, l. 3, na-am (var. nam) ru-rat, which can be most readily traced to the stem מרר *to be bitter*, as the stat. c. from namrurtu. In II R. 35, 5, nam-ri-ir-ru = ša-ra-ru from נמר *to be clear, bright, shine*.

22. pulḥi.—Pl. from pulḥu *fear*; from a root פלח *to be afraid*.

23. urdûni.—Impf. I. from urâr arâdu. Cf. Heb. ירר.

25. limitu.—למה *surround*.

27. tanittu = tanidtu *excellence, loftiness*, from nâdu *to be great, high, majestic*. From a root נאד. The same as tanattu.

39. ušâlik.—III. from אלך *go*; III. *I caused to go*.

44. irti.—Gen. s. fr. irtu *breast*. ארע *to go against*. Cf. mahru *front*, from mahâru *to advance, meet*.

46. ḥirîšê.—Gen. of ḥirîšu *ditch*, from ḥarâšu *dig*, etc.

ušaznin.—III. from zanânu *rain*, III. *cause to rain, pour out*.

49. narbut.—From רבה *to be great, greatness* in the sense of majesty. Cf. II R. 65, 1, Rev. 50, a, where we find “ta-na-ti mâtu Aššûr lidlulu.” Cf. IV. 61, No. 1, 39, “narbika li(id-lu-la) kâl dadme” *may all lands be subject to this greatness*. IV R. 66, 61, a, f, “ludlul nirbika luttâ'id ilûtka nišê ali'ia lišêpa kurdika *may he be subject to thy greatness, may he exalt thy divinity, may the people of my city cause thy strength (bravery) to shine, etc.* Cf. Zimmer “Buss-Ps.” 97, and Haupt, ASKT., p. 121, Rückseite, l. 2, “narbî tanâtika nišu lidlulâ.”

50. ilkakât.—Perhaps a Pilel form fr. alâku. Note also the form “alkakâtu,” Neb. Bors. I. 4. Cf. also the forms urnintu, irnintu, from a root ארן, urnatu = kiššu from a root כיש *to be strong*.

51. ušêziz.—III. 1 p. s. of nazâzu (נזז) *put, place*, from which stem man-zazu *place*.

êtêbir.—I. 2. from êbêru *to cross over*. Cf. Heb. עבר. Note the writings “ê-tê-ib-bi-ru,” Sarg. Cyl. 11; cf. Beh. 35, and also “ê-tab-ru,” Asurn. III. 27, and the III. form “u-šê-bi-ra,” Sanh. Tayl. IV. 32.

COL. II.

2. uparrir.—II. 1 s., from a root פרר *to break*. Heb. פרר.

7. mēšêriš.—Adverb formed from the noun mēšêru, from the root משר *to be straight, right*. Cf. Asurn. I. 22, “šarru ša ina tukulti Ašur u šamaš . . .

mêšêriš ittalakuma;” see also III. 128. Note also the form “išartu,” Neb. II., IV. 19; I. 45, etc. Bors. I. 14.

šaltiš.—Likewise adverb from a root שָׁלַט *plunder, carry off*.

16. mašak.—St. c. from mašku *skin, hide*.

taḥšê.—Gen. from taḥšu. Cf. the Heb. עוֹר תַּחַשׁ and see Prof. Fried. Delitzsch in Baer-Del. “Ezekiel,” p. xvii, and Del. “Proleg.” Note also the writing Asum. III. 64.

21. šitmuri.—Gen. from šitmuru *boisterous, raging*. An I₂ form from a root שָׁמַר *to be boisterous*.

23. The sign “šš” Sb 66 = êdu IV R. 19, 46/47 (AL³ 54) = êštin. Note also K. 4604, or V R. 12, 31, where it = pi-du(u).

24. šattišamma, i. e., šattišáma.—The adverb šattiš from šattu = šantu *year*, with affixed “ma,” which has a generalizing force. Also written “šattišam.”

25. x.—Bê.*

31. attabalkat.—IV₂ Impf. I s. from the quadriliteral stem בָּלַכַּת *rend in pieces, go forward, pass over, also revolt*.

33. ibbalkit.—IV. from same.

34. addî.—Impf. I. I s. from נָדָה (nadû) *throw, to lay, etc.*

37. ina tarši.—A compound prepositional phrase = *at the time of*, also *when*. “taršu,” from “tarâšu” *to put or place straight, direct*. More strictly speaking, it would seem as if “during the reign of” (Haupt, “Nachrichten v. Kön. Gesellschaft,” etc., ’83, No. 4, p. 95) were more exact. The sign employed (No. n) is the equivalent of “êtillu” *lord*, Sb 130, of “malku” *prince*, II R. 26, 15, e, of “šarru” V R. 16, 7a, and of “tarâšu,” V R. 31, 64, e. (Note the reading in I. 63, “it-ta-in-ra-aš.”) See ZKF. II. 106.

40. lubulti = lubušti.—Like “rihiltu” for “riḥiṣtu,” etc. From a root לָבַשׁ *clothe*. “lubulti birmê” = *woven stuff*, better than *variegated stuff (cloth)*, as I have translated II. “burrumu” = *weave*.

* The meaning of these signs I do not know; but to be noted is II R. 62, 66, g, h, from which it follows that this sign = “imêru” (cf. Aram. מְרִיכָא *trestle, pedestal of a column*). In this list we have given the different parts of a vessel,—“kakkaru,” “šdu,” “karnu,” “šilu,” “igāru,” “kiš-kitti” (cf. Aram. קִישְׁקִי), and then “imêru,” followed by “markasu,” “dimmu,” “arkatu,” etc. The sign “bê” could mean *large* or *finished*, according to ASKT. 13, 130 and 127 resp. (Cf. ALs³, p. 86, small frag.,—or II R. No. 6, 47,—where “imêru” accompanies “kussû” *seat, throne*.) The words “imêri êlippi” mean literally *ass of the ship*. So also Del. *Assyr. Stud.* Connected with the fact that the ass is proverbially the beast of burden, and that the sign is also used as a determinative before the words for horse, ox, etc., may it not be possible that this combination X+Bê may mean *finished* (or *wrought*) *prows* for such galleys as are represented on the bas-reliefs in the north-east corner of the Assyrian Department in the Louvre? The prows of these vessels are surmounted by the figure of a horse’s head, upon which, together with an upright in the stern of the vessel, part of the ship’s burden of logs is transported, while the remainder is towed behind. If this be so, the upright and horizontal wedges of the sign (corrections No. 90) would then be the usual “mê” = 100.

kitû *linen*. Cf. Arab. "kutun"? and for the reading of the ideog. see II R. 44, 7, g, h, etc.

50. mundaḥḥiṣê = mundaḥḥiṣê = muntaḥḥiṣê.—II. Part. pl. fr. מַחֲץ *strike, beat, etc.*

51. Ša-ga.—I have not ventured on a reading. Though in view of V R. 11, 38, 39, a, b, c, it would seem as if "ma-ak-ku-ri" were at least a possible reading. The last sign, however, in V R., as also in AL.³ 127, 3b, is so uncertain as to leave us in doubt here. The oft-repeated "bušâṣunu šallasunu namkuršunu" in Tig. I. would seem to favor the reading "makkuru." In Col. v. 52 and 61, however, we find "maršišunu" instead of "namkuršunu." The passage, Tig. II. 30, f, "ruḫḫê êri, v. nirmak siparri itti ilâniṣunu ḥurâši kaspi" and then the appositional or explanatory phrase with the verb "aššâ,"* "dumuḫ namkurriṣunu," would seem to point to a greater value ascribed to the "namkurri" than to the "šallasunu bušasunu," to which is added the verb "ušêša." For a discussion of the ideog. "ŠA-GA." see ZKF. II. 303, 4, where the author thinks that, if any transcription be admissible, it is that of "makkuru," reading "makkuru" in V R. 11, without any doubt.

55. kiššûti.—From a root כִּשַׁשׁ *to be strong*, from which we have the reduplicated adjective "kaškâšu"† *very strong*, like "dandânu."

60. urninti.—From a root אָרַן *to be powerful*. "urnâtu" is a synonym of "kiššu," fr. the above root.

69. šadê.—Gen. of "šadû" *mountain*, from a root שָׂדָה, which V R. 28, 82, g, h, apparently gives as a syn. of "gablu" and "šaḫû" *high*. Halévy, ZKF. Bd. II. 306, would compare with the Aram. שָׂרָא *throw, project*, i. e., lengthwise. See Fried. Del., "Hebrew Language," and "Proleg."

75. KI-LAL.—The reading I do not know; but the meaning "weight" seems certain. In I R. 25, 66, we read "unût êkallêšu (note the reading as confirming correction) madûtê ša Ki-Lal lâ ṣab-ta-at;" 1. 75 the same. In K. 177, 10, we read "5 mana 50 šiklu ḥurâṣu KI-LALšunu" = *five mana and fifty shekels their weight*. "Lal" (see q) alone = "šaḫâlu" *weigh*, Sb 145; but whether the ideog. "Ki-Lal" (see r) is to be explained by the same root I do not know.

77. urbatê.—V R. 47, I. 50, gives "urbatu" = "urbanu," with which cf. the Chaldee אֲרָבִינָא (and Syr. اَرْبَعِيْن) *willow, rush*, as distinguished from קִנִּי *hart reed*.

ittabkû.—I. pl. 3. m. from "abâku" *to turn* (אַבַּךְ).

81. nakanti.‡ = "nakamtu" from a root נָכַם *to heap up*, pl. "nakamâtê."

* *lifted up, gathered together*, as smaller, more precious articles could.

† I R. 35, No. 2, 2, etc.

‡ Also אֲרָבִינָא and אֲרָבִינָא

§ This change of *m* to *n* before the dentals and sibilants is frequent. Cf. in our text "mundaḥiṣu" = "muntahišu;" also the words "tênšu" = "têmsu," "ḥanṭu" = "ḥamṭu," "tanšilu" = "tamšilu," "ḥanšâ" = "ḥamšâ."

86. iḳabûšuni.—“iḳabû” 1. pres. pl. fr. קבא *speak, call*, etc.

99. ḥarpalu.—Derivation unknown. The meaning of this word, as well as of “imiš,” I have conjectured from the context. They appear to me to stand in the same construction, and certainly the meaning attached gives at least sense.

100. imiṣ.—Seems to be a st. con. from a noun “imṣu.” The reading “im-iṣṣir” (Schrader) seems *very* doubtful.

Šê-Tar.—I have thought may equal “šuzubu,” and “Napraru” I have referred to “parâru” * *break*, etc., from which could come the idea of confusion, commotion.

urapšu.—Might be II. from a root רפּשׁ = “urappišu.”

duburi.—Seems to me *back*. See Zimmeru “Bab. Buss.” for stem “dapâru” which probably means “turn,” etc.

These last notes on 99 and 100 I have given only to explain the ideas which govern my translation of these difficult lines.

* Cf. “napharu” fr. פחר, “nalbašu,” fr. לבש, etc., etc.

Corrections to M.R. pp. 7-8.

Abbrevs. pl. = plain, w. = wanting; n.w. = nothing wanting
The numbers refer to the transliteration.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. [𐎠𐎡𐎢 𐎣𐎤 𐎥𐎦] supplied from Obelisk, Lay. 87. 1v 2. | 30. '𐎦' R. w. 31. 𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩 = ur-du. |
| 2. 𐎦𐎧 = la, 2 ^a [𐎦𐎧] 1/2 cent. broken | 32. '𐎦' R. w. 33. 𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩. 34. 𐎦𐎧 |
| 3. 𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩 𐎪𐎫 𐎬𐎭 so separated, & 'na' as in nâdu l. 6. | 35. 𐎦𐎧. 36. 𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩 36 ^a '𐎦' w. |
| 4. 𐎦𐎧 restored from traces. | 37. 𐎦𐎧 R. erased. 38. 𐎦𐎧. 39. 𐎦𐎧. |
| 5. [𐎦𐎧] no trace of 'ri' as in R. | 40. 𐎦 pl. also 𐎦. 41. 𐎦 sic! |
| 6. 𐎦 i.e. 𐎦a. written on the round of the arm - hence the inclination. Not '𐎦' R. cf. Assm. I. 42. | 42. 𐎦𐎧 = 𐎦𐎧 43. 𐎦𐎧 sic! 44. n.w. |
| 7. 𐎦𐎧. 8. 𐎦𐎧 = si | 45. 𐎦𐎧 pl 46. 𐎦𐎧... 𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩. |
| 8 ^a w. 9. 𐎦𐎧 erased. | 47. [𐎦𐎧]. 48. 5 centimetres broken thus. |
| 10. 𐎦𐎧. 11. 𐎦𐎧. | 49. 𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩 𐎪𐎫 𐎬𐎭 𐎦𐎧. |
| 12. 𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩 𐎪𐎫. 13. 𐎦𐎧 w. | 50. [𐎦𐎧]. 50 ^a 𐎦𐎧. 50 ^b [𐎦𐎧]. 51. 𐎦𐎧. |
| 13 ^a 𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩 The two upright wedges being on the raised part of figure | 52. '𐎦' R. w. 53. 𐎦𐎧. 54. 𐎦𐎧 54 ^a 𐎦𐎧 |
| 14. '𐎦' R. w. 15. 𐎦𐎧 = ra? | 55. 𐎦 pl. 56. n.w. 56 ^a 𐎦𐎧. 56 ^b 𐎦𐎧 w. |
| 16. 𐎦𐎧. 17. [𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩]. | 57. 𐎦. 58. 𐎦𐎧. 59. '𐎦' w. |
| 18. 𐎦𐎧. 19. 𐎦 w. | 60. 𐎦𐎧. 60 ^a 𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩. 61. [𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩]. |
| 20. 𐎦𐎧 = 𐎦. 21. 𐎦𐎧. 22. 𐎦𐎧. | 62. 𐎦𐎧. 63. 𐎦𐎧. 64. n.w. |
| 23. 𐎦𐎧. 24. 𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩. | 65. 𐎦? 66. '𐎦' R. w. 67. 𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩 |
| 25. 𐎦𐎧. 26. 𐎦. 27. 𐎦𐎧 R. w. | Col. II. |
| 28. '𐎦' R. w. 29. 𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩 𐎪𐎫 The | 68. [𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩] 𐎦 𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩 cf. I. 47. |
| | 69. 𐎦. 70. 𐎦𐎧? 71. 𐎦𐎧 = 𐎦𐎧. |
| | 72. 𐎦 73. pl. 74. 𐎦. 75. [𐎦𐎧]. |
| | 76. 𐎦𐎧. 77. 𐎦𐎧. 78. n.w. |
| | 79. 𐎦𐎧 𐎨𐎩 80. 𐎦𐎧. 81. 𐎦. |

82.		83.	84.	156.	157. 158 159.		
85.		86.	87.	88.	160.	161.	162.
89.		90.	91.	163.		164.	
92.		93.	94.	165.		166.	
95.		96.	97.	167.		168.	169. R.w.
98.		99. [] 1. Cent. broken.	170.		171.	172.	172 ²
100.		101. [173.		174.	175.	
102.		103.	104.	176.		177.	
	Prof. Delitzsch (Vorlesg.) 105.			178.		179.	180.
106.		107.	108.	181.		182.	183.
109.		110.	111.	184.		185.	186.
112.		113.	114.	187.		188.	189. The usual form
115.		116. []. No traces of	of 'ra' is , of 'an' , of 'da' , of 'ru' , of 'sa' of 'a' of 'li' .				
	the sign in R. v. Del. AL ³ No. 39. Cf. I. 46, II. 98. 117 [] 118						
119.		120.	121.	Signs discussed in the Notogor cited in discussion.			
122.		123.					
124.		125. R. w. 126.					
	cf. l. 60. 127. []						
128.		129.	a.				
130.		131. R. w.	c. , d. var.				
132.		133.	e. f.				
135.		136.	g. h. i.				
138.		139.	j. k.				
141.		142. [] 143.	l. m.				
144.		145.	n.				
147.		148.	o.				
150.		151.	p.				
153.		154.	q.				

TIKKUN SOPHERIM.

BY REV. OLIVER TURNBULL CRANE,

Princeton, New Jersey.

There are various passages in the present Massoretic text of the Hebrew Bible which in the past have frequently been charged as willful alterations made by Jewish scribes in what may be called *the true original text*. These changes, it is contended, were intentionally made, in conformity with the traditional decrees of the ancient scribes, transmitted from generation to generation, for the purpose of removing certain objectionable anthropomorphic characteristics attributed to the person of Yahweh, which were shocking to the reverential spirit of a pious Israelite, and inconsistent with his exalted conception of the dignity, character and attributes of the deity; or, in other words, there were expressions in the *true original text* which the scribes deemed had a tendency to degrade or detract from the holy and supreme attributes of Yahweh. These, under the pious sanction of tradition, they deliberately altered, so as to bring the words of the Book into conformity with their religious ideas. Whether this indictment is sustained by the evidence is a question for students of biblical criticism to decide. It is the intention of this article simply to specify the particular passages thus arraigned, being prompted by the conviction that this specific branch of textual criticism has been hitherto unwarrantably neglected.

The emendations above referred to have, in Rabbinical lore, received the name of "Tikkun Sopherim" (תיקון סופרים *corrections of the scribes*), and are eighteen in number, confined to no individual book or portion of the Old Testament, but occurring promiscuously throughout the whole body of the canon. Their complete enumeration is found carefully preserved among the compilations of the *Massorah Magna* and the *Ochlah W'Ochlah* (אכלה ואכלה), or alphabetic lists of Massoretic comments or notes. Mention is also frequently made of them in the numerous writings of the Rabbins, with, however, an apparent apologetic tone, or with a somewhat labored and almost superstitious attempt at their justification. This defensive position, during the middle ages, was in no small degree demanded by the writings of the celebrated Spanish orientalist, Raymond Martin¹ (1220—1287), who directly and publicly charged these emendations upon the Hebrew scribes as "willful corruptions and perversions introduced by them into the sacred text." As a fair illustration of the character and weight of these apologetics, we may cite the introduction to the Bomberg Rabbinical Bible of 1526, written by the eminent Jewish scholar, Jacob ben Chajim, of whom it may be

¹ Author of a work entitled *Pugio Fidei Christianae*, published in 1278, in which he shows great knowledge and familiarity with the writings and opinions of the Jews, and combats them with keen arguments drawn from the works of their own Rabbins.

truthfully said that, as an authority in Hebrew tradition and lore, he had no superior. A brief quotation must suffice. In refutation of the charge he says: "Thus it is that they (i. e., the Sopherim) made no willful changes. But if they (i. e., those making the charge) will persist in it in spite of what the Ga'on (i. e., Rabbi Nathan Ben Jachiel, 1030—1106, author of the celebrated lexicon *Aruch* ערוך), of blessed memory, says, we can repel them with the power of the argument as follows: Can any man believe that, if one intends to make willful alterations and changes, he would say, See what willful changes I have made, especially in the Prophets? Yet we find the Massorah declares, In five passages the Waw (ו) has been removed by the scribes (עטור סופרים), etc. Again, eighteen words are emendations of the scribes (תקון סופרים), etc. Now, if they had intended to make willful changes, they would surely not have proclaimed what they have changed and said, 'eighteen words are *Tikkun Sopherim*' as given in the *Mechilta* (מכילתא) a Midrashic exposition of Exod. XII.—XXXV. 3, composed in the first century A. D.). Moreover, the Sopherim made no changes or corrections; they only submitted that the text ought originally to have been so and so, but is veiled in other expressions, out of respect to the *Shechina*, as you will find out by examining the subject. The same is the case with the Q'rî and K'thîbh (קרי וכתב): they (i. e. the Sopherim) point out what they have altered, if peradventure you choose to characterize them as alterations. We, of the class of believers, however, believe that they all are a law of Moses from Sinai (i. e. the original readings) including the emendations of the scribes (תיקון סופרים). But even if you still insist that the Sopherim did make alterations (תקנו הסופרים), the alterations in question neither raise nor lower the points upon which the heretics rest. Consult also the work done for Ptolemy, the king (i. e. The Septuagint) and you will see that in the thirteen instances where they made changes, they state the reason why they have made these alterations, and what these alterations are, in what they did for him. In conclusion, the heretics can have nothing to say in this matter" (Dr Ginsburg's translation, 1867).

For an exposition of the views heretofore commonly entertained by the Christian (as distinguished from the Jewish) critics on these matters, perhaps no abler exponent can be found than Johanne Leusden (1624—99) whose utterances in reference to the subject in question, have been, more than once, cited as of no little authority. We will therefore quote from his *Philologus Hebraeus* (third ed. 1686). In vol. I. under the section headed, *De Ordinatione Scribarum*, page 270, after having given a full list of the *Tikkun Sopherim*, he continues: "Occasione horum locorum quaeritur, An ex hac correctione Scribarum in octodecim illis locis non sequatur corruptio Textus Hebraici?"

"*Respondeo.* Galatinus¹ lib. I. cap. 8. probaturus Scribas multa in S. Script-

¹ Peter Galatin, a learned Franciscan monk, who lived early in the 16th century and wrote a treatise entitled "De Arcanis Catholicae Veritatis." A work of great merit and often since quoted. It is hostile to Rabbinical views on the questions in dispute. Buxtorf succinctly states

ura depravasse, utitur argumento desumpto ab octodecim vocibus, quae vocantur **תיקון סופרים** *correctio Scribarum*. Non quidem vult Judaeos depravasse Textus illo malo animo, sed propter rationes probabiles, et addit has depravationes esse restituendas ex Talmude Judaico: nam credit ea loca aliter olim fuisse lecta quam jam legunter. Sed falsa est haec Galatini assertio: nunquam S. Scriptura a Judaeis datâ operâ corrupta est. Obstat enim specialis Judaeorum reverentia sive potius superstitio erga S. Scripturam, quam Philo Judaeus probat cum ait: *Quenlibet Judaeum potius centies esse moriturum, quam ut pateretur Legem in aliquo mutari*. Sed instabit forte nonnemo. Octodecim voces vocantur *Correctio Scribarum*: ergo Scribae videntur quaedam loca mutasse, quae antea erant depravatae.

“*Respondeo* (1) Si per *Scribas* intelligantur Ezras et Viri Synagogae magnae, tum dicendum est illos S. Scripturam in *octodecim* illis locis non depravasse, sed emendasse, et antiquam lectionem restituisse. Multi non sine ratione per **סופרים** *Scribas* intelligunt Ezram et Viros Synagogae magnae; et non sine ratione: nam *Numer.* II. 15, Masora pro **תיקון סופרים** *Ordinatio Scribarum* expresse dicit **תקן עזרא** *Correctio Ezrae*. (2) Si per *Scribas* intelligantur Masorethae post-talmudici, tum responderi potest illos testari non quid re vera factum sit, sed quid factum esse Hebraeorum Rabbini tradunt. (3) Mihi verosimile videtur per *Scribas* esse intelligendos ipsos Auctores librorum, scil. Mosen et Prophetas, qui sic scripserunt, prout hodie scriptum est: verum Sapientes Hebraeorum viderunt inconvenientiam quandam in illis locis, ideoque judicarunt primos Auctores propter antecedentia et consequentia aliter loqui et scribere debuisse; sed maluisse ita scribere, prout hodie scriptum est. Hanc sententiam approbat S. Jarchi in Comment. ad Geneseos Caput 18, ubi ait:—**היה לו לכתוב** *scribendum ipsi* (Mosi) *erat, Dominus stabat*. Jarchi non asserit Mosen aliter scripsisse quam jam in Textu invenitur; sed judicat Mosen aliter debuisse vel potius potuisse scribere. Sapientes ergo Hebraeorum observarunt honorem Dei sive cohaerentiam Textus aliter quidem requirere; sed quia Scribae, hoc est, Auctores librorum ita scripserunt, ideo monuerunt talem lectionem esse retinendam; et propterea dixerunt, *Scribarum est ordinatio*, sive ipsi Auctores ita ordinarunt. In hanc sententiam etiam inclinat Buxtorsius apud Glassium pag. 57.”

This, it will be noticed, is substantially the plea of the scribes, only perhaps more perspicuously stated. And such practically for the most part remains to this day the argument (i. e. as far as any advance based upon thorough critical investigation is concerned), adduced by the very few critics who have at all given their attention to this question.

As one of the many preliminary researches, necessary to a thorough sifting and proving of the Massoretic text, and as a further incentive to the study of the whole subject of Lower Criticism, as it is related to the Hebrew Scriptures, it the argumentative position of *De Arcanis* when he says “Galatinus lib. I. cap. 8, ait loca ista [i. e. **תיקון סופרים**] a Scribis fuisse CORRECTA ET CORRUPTA.” Lex. Rad. תקן.

cannot but result in good to give a list of these disputed passages, though they be only accompanied with the briefest of critical comments. Meanwhile leaving to others, better fitted to undertake the laborious, though far more important task of exhaustively inquiring into and passing final judgment upon the whole matter, which, though hitherto to a large extent overlooked, is now too important to be superficially treated or longer ignored, we proceed to present these emendations, in the order in which they occur in the Hebrew Bible, designating for convenience, the, what may be called, *true original text*, with the letter כ as an abbreviation of the word כתיב, and the present Massoretic text, with the letter ת as an abbreviation of the phrase תיקון סופרים, and withal with a fixed purpose of confining the accompanying remarks and critical comments to as brief a compass as the requirements of each case will allow.

I. First in regular order then we take up Genesis XVIII. 22.

(כ). "And the men turned from thence, and went toward Sodom : but Yahweh still *remained* standing before Abraham (ויהוה עורנו עמד לפני אברהם)."

(ת). "And the men turned from thence, and went toward Sodom : but Abraham still *remained* standing before Yahweh (ואברהם עורנו עמד לפני יהוה)."

It is absolutely necessary that the context should be carefully studied, not only in connection with the above passage, but also with all others that may hereafter be quoted. Indeed in this particular instance, the force of the immediate context has such weight, as to almost irresistibly impel one to the conviction of the probability and reasonableness of the reading in כ, and so violent (if the expression be permitted) is the rupture in the logical continuity of thought in ת that almost any unprejudiced reader is constrained to pause after finishing it, and go over it a second time, impressed with the idea that he could not have read it aright. But mere probability, however reasonable, it must be allowed, unsupported by extraneous evidence of authenticity, will not warrant the adoption of כ, in any case, as the true text. To the question, whether there is sufficient circumstantial and corroborative testimony, we shall have something to say hereafter. For the present let us see what a few of the critics have to say *ad hoc*.

Leusden in *Philologus Hebraeus* (3d ed. Vol. I. page 269) says : "Gen. XVIII. 22. "Ubi Abraham dicitur stetisse coram JEHOVAH. Judaei putant magis ad honorem Dei esse, si scriptum fuisset, et JEHOVAH stabat coram Abrahamo. Masora parya annotat esse ח מלין תקון סופרים octodecim voces, quae vocantur *Ordinatio Scribarum*. Scribae cogitarunt: fotasse homines quidam hunc Textum posteriori modo legent, eamque depravabunt: ideo ordinarunt, ut omnes versum illum legerent, sicuti scriptus est, etiamsi Textus verba aliquid gloriae divinae videantur detrahare."

Dr. C. C. H. Wright, in his work entitled, "The Book of Genesis in Hebrew" (London, 1859), has the following: "This is one of the eighteen passages marked in the Massora as תקון סופרים. In these passages the Massorites thought

that there was something derogatory to the glory of God; e. g., in the passage under consideration they thought it would have been better expressed,—Jehovah stood yet before Abraham; but lest it should be read in that way, they have noted that the reading in the text is the true one" (page 60).

Dr. Wright, it will be seen, has followed Leusden, as to argument, very closely, even to the verge of being illogical; for how is to be reconciled the statement, "In these passages [i. e., as they now read] the Massorites thought that there was something derogatory to the glory of God," and the words of *Jacob ben Chajim* as quoted above, viz., "that the text ought originally to have been so and so, but is veiled in other expressions, out of respect to the Shechina"? One can hardly credit the scribes with employing such contradictory lines of defense, though Leusden does charge them with declaring for the integrity of the present text "*etiamsi Textus verba aliquid gloriæ divinæ videantur detrahere.*" It would seem as if these critics had not materially strengthened the position of the Rabbins.

Far more frank and consistent, however, is the modern Jewish opinion on this subject, as expressed in the valuable commentary, "The Scriptures, Hebrew and English," by De Sola, Lindenthal and Raphall, published at London, 1844, where in Vol. I., page 96, referring to this passage we read: "Rashi remarks that according to the context it should have been, *the Lord yet stood before Abraham*, but the Massorites have altered it to the present reading. The reason seems to be that the expression to *stand before another* implies, in scriptural language, a state of inferiority and homage." The honest candor and almost anti-Jewish tone so prominent in the above comment, and considering the eminent source from which it springs, adds greatly to its intrinsic value, and contributes no little support to the position taken by Bleek in his "Introduction to the Old Testament" (2d ed., translated by Venables) Vol. II., page 459, where treating of the whole subject of the "Tikkun Sopherim," he, specifically referring to this passage, says, "The words, Abraham stood yet before Jehovah" (Gen. XVIII. 22), are a *correctio scribarum* for, Jehovah stood yet before Abraham. I consider that it is very probable that the latter is the original reading, for this mode of expression is better suited to the context. They were induced to make the alteration, because it was considered unseemly to say, that Jehovah stood before Abraham, this phraseology often being made use of to point out a relation of dependence."

The nature and scope of this article do not admit of further comment on this verse; indeed the limits of our allotted space will hereafter compel us to confine ourselves to little more than the bare enumeration of the remaining passages of the list.

II. Numbers XI. 15.

(ב). "And if thus thou art about to deal with me, then slay me, I pray thee, at once, if I have found favor in thy eyes: that I may not see thy evil, (ברעתך)" i. e. the punishment wherewith thou wilt visit Israel.

(ת). "And if thus thou art about to deal with me, then slay me, I pray thee, at once, if I have found favor in thy eyes: that I may not see my evil (ברעת)."

The reason for this emendation (if it be one) is very readily apparent, for כ was possibly liable to be construed as ascribing "evil" (רעה) to Yahweh; the removing, therefore, of this possibility would be forsooth a most sufficient justification in the eyes of the scribes for the correction.

It is necessary here to add, that besides the reading in כ given above, there is a second form of the last word handed down by the Massorites, viz., ברעתם *malum ipsorum*, and what is remarkable, one of the Targums (Jerusalemi) corroborates this tradition; for, among its preserved fragments, we find the last clause rendered thus: ולא אחמי בבשתהון רעמך "that I may not see the evil of them who are thy people."

If now this latter text (ברעתם) be adopted as the more probable original form of כ, then there would seem to be some justification for the conservative argument adduced by Leusden and quoted above (see page 235 commencing with "(3) Mihi verosimile videtur, etc.," through to the end of the extract); for there would then be no apparent reason which could lead the scribe to substitute another reading for the one already existing, as it would obviously be already the most natural mode of expressing the idea which the tenor of the context logically demands, and that, too, without having any features which could possibly be conceived of as derogatory to the Deity. But if on the other hand, we take the former reading (ברעתך) to be the correct recension, then there arises an inevitable presumption, more or less conclusive, that the emendation did originate as charged, because of the cogency of the evident motive in the case. To which text the final preference ought to be given is a question to be decided solely by a preponderance of evidence, based upon a thorough critical investigation, and such we cannot here enter upon.

III. and IV. Num. xii. 12.

(ז). "Let her not, I pray, be as the dead, through whose proceeding from the womb of our own mother (אמנו), the half of our own flesh (בשרנו) would thus be consumed."

(ת). "Let her not, I pray, be as the dead *born child*, which when it comes out of its mother's (אמו) womb, has half of its flesh (בשרו) consumed."

Here it will be noticed are two *Tikkun Sopherim*, the causes for which are not very apparent. Possibly the motive might have been, that by כ a reflection seemed somehow to be cast upon the mother of Moses. At any rate it seems difficult to conceive how anything stated in כ could possibly, by the most fertile imagination, yea, even that of a Hebrew scribe, be considered as expressing or implying disrespect to Yahweh.

V. 1 Sam. iii. 13.

(כ). "And I tell him that I will judge his house forever, for the iniquity which he knew, for his sons cursed me (לי), and he rebuked them not."

(ת). "And I tell him that I will judge his house forever, for the iniquity which he knew, for his sons did bring a curse upon themselves (להם), and he rebuked them not."

The Septuagint renders this clause as follows:—*ὅτι κακολογούντες Θεὸν οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ* which significantly corroborates כ, if it does not, in fact, lend weight to the view that the original reading was אלהים (Θεὸν) rather than לי. But at all events, the idea is identically the same, as Buxtorf indicates when he says, "לי mihi, scil. Deo."¹ The motive underlying the emendation in this case is obvious enough. It was too offensive to believe that the sons of Eli could openly blaspheme God, and Eli be cognizant of it, and yet not reprimand them.

The text, as it now stands, in ת, confessedly presents many difficulties to a lucid interpretation; this fact conjoined with the above evidence strongly leads to the conclusion that it has undergone a corruption.²

VI. 2 Sam. xvi. 12.

(כ). "Perhaps Yahweh will behold with his eye (בעינו), and Yahweh will requite me good instead of his cursing this day."

(ת). "Perhaps Yahweh will look on my eye (בעיני), and will requite me good instead of his cursing this day."

There is great doubt and uncertainty as to the correct reading in this verse, the Massorites, for once, being far less explicit than we could wish that they had been. The above recension has been adopted, as, on the whole, the more probable one; though it must be confessed, not without considerable doubt as to its correctness. Perhaps we cannot more clearly show the confusion which rests on this matter, than by quoting from Buxtorf³, "Hunc locum Massora utroque loco adducit: recensetur quoque in libro Tanchuma, in Parascha Beschallach in Exodus: sed in qua voce תיקון consistat, non explicant. Commentatores hic quoque nullius תיקון meminerunt, cum alias R. Solomon et R. David loca ista adducere et explicare soleant. Pro בעני, ut Massora ponit, in textu scriptum est בעוני, quod interpretes dicunt esse idem quod בעני afflictionem meam, sed legitur בעיני oculum meum, id est, lachrymas oculorum meorum."

The form בעינו found in כ, undoubtedly might be open to the imputation of conveying anthropomorphic ideas of Yahweh, and hence would of course be objectionable to the scribes; but what should induce the alteration of בעוני my

¹ Lex. Rad., תקן.

² Cf. Lange-Schaff Com., vol. on Samuel, note 13, p. 87.

³ Lex. Rad., תקן.

⁴ "The Commentary Tanchuma (Consolation) on the section Beschallach (chapter xiii. 17 to chapter xviii.) in Exodus." This is a Midrashic work probably written early in the ninth century. It covers the entire Pentateuch.

iniquity (i. e. the wrong done me), if this be indeed the original reading, to **בעיני** *my eye* (i. e. my tears), or even to the more reasonable **בעני** *my affliction*, is by no means apparent, nor does Dr. Erdmann shed much light upon it, when he remarks, "The Massorites were not able to comprehend how David, guiltless in respect to this reviling, could acknowledge himself guilty,"¹ for the term does not necessarily imply any acknowledgment whatever, of personal guilt, on the part of David.

VII. and VIII. 1 Kgs. xii. 16 and 2 Chron. x. 16.

(ב). And when all Israel saw that the king hearkened not unto them, the people answered the king saying, "What portion have we in David? nor have we an inheritance in the son of Jesse; [every man] to his God (**לאלהיו**), O Israel! now see to thine own house, David!" So [all] Israel departed to their God (**לאלהיו**).

(ת). And when all Israel saw that the king hearkened not unto them, the people answered the king saying, "What portion have we in David? nor have we an inheritance in the son of Jesse: [every man] to thy tents (**לאהליך**), O Israel! now see to thine own house David?" So [all] Israel departed to their tents (**לאהליך**).

Here the wording of ב graphically brings out the idea that the rebellious separation of Israel from the house of David, was, in the mind of the writer, nothing less than a renunciation of Yahweh, and a direct transition to idolatry; but it is readily conceivable that the terms employed might be considered by devout scribes as altogether too vigorous language, and besides as intimating, not alone disrespect, but even open defiance of Yahweh, and the subsequent delay of merited punishment might by some be perversely construed as a circumstance going to show that Yahweh could be contemptuously treated with impunity. In fact ת does not, in reality change the idea contained in ב, but only clothes it in a less objectionable dress, for Israel did forsake the sanctuary at Jerusalem for the worship of idolatry in tents at Bethel and Dan.

IX. Jeremiah ii. 11.

(כ). "Hath a nation changed its gods? and yet they are no gods, but my people have changed my glory (**כבודי**) for that which doth not profit (i. e. an idol)."

(ת). "Hath a nation changed its gods? and yet they are no gods, but my people have changed their glory (**כבודי**), for that which doth not profit."

Here the ת, as we have seen in previous instances, does not alter the essential thought in the least, but by a slight modification of one small letter י, an offensive feature in ב is removed. There can be no doubt but that "their glory" refers to the Lord; the context imperatively demands such an interpretation. Neumann, arguing in favor of this point, is constrained to say: "Daher konnte

¹ Lange Schaff Com., p. 509.

Petrus Galatinus meinen (*De Arcanis Cath. Verit.* I. c. 8, p. 30), es heisse ursprünglich כבודי.¹ The correction in this case is of the same character as those in XI. and XV. and the motive underlying each is identical.

X. Ezekiel VIII. 17.

(כ). "Then said he unto me, Hast thou seen *this*, O son of man? Is it a light matter to the house of Judah to commit the abominations which they commit here? for they have filled the land with violence and they constantly repeat to provoke me to anger, and, lo, they put the branch to my nose (אפי)."

(ת). The same, except the last clause which reads: "and, lo, they put the branch to their nose (אפם)."

This passage perhaps requires no comment, and yet there is one view of it which we do not wish to overlook. The anthropomorphism in כ is so pronounced, taken in connection with the immediate context, as to almost awaken repugnance in one, even though not a Jew, unfamiliar with this reading. How much greater then, the painful recoil which it would always have produced in the minds of devout Hebrews, had it been the received recension.² But on a closer unprejudiced inspection, much of its seemingly objectionable character disappears.

The generally adopted interpretation put upon the word זמורה "branch," is that it is connected with some idolatrous practice of the Persians in their worship of the sun. Now if this be correct, what is more reasonable or appropriate than that the Lord, in enumerating the great abominations committed by the house of Israel, should culminate the recital by saying: *And, lo, they flaunt the very insignia of their idolatry in my face*, and thus we would obtain a most forcible exposition of a passage otherwise very obscure, for certain it is, that the critics and commentators hitherto have not, on the basis of the textus receptus ("put the branch to their nose"), altogether satisfactorily explained this verse.³

XI. Hosea IV. 7.

(כ) "The more they increased, the more did they sin against me: my glory they changed into shame (כבודי בקלון המירו)."

(ת). "The more they increased, the more did they sin against me: I will change their glory into shame (כבודם בקלון אמיר)."

A full explication of the verbal changes implied in this *Tikkun* is wanting. In most of the authorities we find simply the most meagre statements. As an illustration of this, take Leusden's remark⁴ "כבודם *gloriam ipsorum* pro כבודי *gloriam meam*," which literally carried out would result in the unintelligible phrase: "My glory I will change into shame;" for it is utterly incongruous with the context, and besides, has no relevancy or harmony with the explanations given by

¹ Jeremias, vol. I., p. 200. Leipzig, 1854.

² But as to the use of the expression אפי, elsewhere, by Yahweh, consult Isa. lxxv. 5.

³ Cf. Lange-Schaff Commentary ad hoc loco.

⁴ Philol. Heb., vol. I., p. 270.

the Rabbins, as to the origin of *Tikkun Sopherim*; or yet with the theories of their opponents. It is too irrational a supposition to be entertained for a moment, that the ancient scribes thus intended it to be understood. I have, therefore, adopted in כ, the only consistent interpretation that has presented itself in the course of a somewhat careful investigation: it is, at least, in perfect accord with the analogous changes to be found in IX. and XV. The motive leading to the alteration in this case is self-apparent. It was offensive to think that wicked mortal man had the power to debase, in any degree, the glory of the infinite Yahweh.

XII. Habakkuk i. 12.

(כ). "Art not thou from everlasting, O Yahweh, my God, my Holy One? Thou diest not (לא תמות). O Yahweh, thou hast ordained him for judgment; and thou, O Rock, hast established him for correction."

(ת). "Art not thou from everlasting, O Yahweh, my God, my Holy One? We shall not die (לא נמות)," etc., etc.

It almost seems unnecessary to do more than simply quote Ewald upon this passage; he says, verse 12, "להוכיח ולמשפט", according to the sense of the passage, refer as plainly to the Chaldean himself, as תמות must be read instead of נמות, contrary to the Massora and LXX. in ד צור answers to לא תמות. The phrase which appeared objectionable to a good many ancient readers, really expresses only our idea of *immortality*; but, *we shall not die*, or ולא נמות LXX. [καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνομεν] *that we die not*, is a thought which is quite foreign to the passage."¹

In this opinion Bleek also concurs, for he says: "—from the context it is very probable, as Ewald also thinks, that לא תמות is the genuine reading, which on account of the expression seeming offensive, they [the *Sopherim*] thought they ought to alter."² This is, moreover, substantiated by the Targum, which thus paraphrases the clause in question: מִימְרָךְ קִים לְעַלְמִין "Thy word endureth forever." R. Sol. Isaaci (Rashi) also adopts this reading, quoting it as the original writing of the prophet. In this connection it is a significant fact worthy of note, that the Revised Version of 1884 has to this particular verse the marginal comment, "According to an ancient Jewish tradition, *thou diest not*." Undoubtedly to the ancient Scribes, it was considered unbefitting to speak of *death* at all in regard to Yahweh, even though, as in this case, the direct denial of the Lord's ever experiencing it, was predicated.

XIII. Zechariah ii. 12. (A. V. verse 8.)

(כ). For thus saith Yahweh of hosts, (for the sake of *your* glory hath he sent me unto the nations which despoil you), 'He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of my eye (עֵינִי).' "

¹ Commentary on the Prophets, Smith's translation, vol. III., p. 36.

² Introduction to the O. T., 2d ed., by Venables, vol. II., p. 459.

(ת). "For thus saith Yahweh of hosts, for the sake of *your* glory hath he sent me unto the nations which despoil you, for he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye (עֵינִי)." ¹

Here the Sopherim thought that they could detect a tendency toward anthropomorphism, similar to that displayed in X. The main objectionable element in both these passages, appears to have been, that the pronominal suffix employed (*' my*) seemed to imply that Yahweh *himself* ascribed to *himself* certain degrading anthropomorphic characteristics. Moreover the Lord is never elsewhere represented as himself using the personal pronoun *my* in conjunction with so pronounced an anthropomorphism as, "apple of the eye." Its use, therefore, in this exceptional case, might be construed as an inconsistency, and hence derogatory to the divine character.

XIV. Malachi i. 13.

(כ). "And ye have said, Behold, what a bore it is. And ye have snuffed at me (אֹתִי), saith Yahweh of hosts; and ye have brought that which was taken by violence, and the lame, and the sick; thus have ye brought the offering: should I accept this from you? saith Yahweh."

(ת). "And ye have said, Behold, what a bore it is; and ye have snuffed at it (אֹתוֹ), saith Yahweh of hosts," etc.

Commenting on this verse, Keil and Delitzsch remark: "Jerome thinks that instead of אֹתוֹ we might read אֹתִי, which is found in a good number of codices."¹ They, however, feel constrained, on general principles, to reject the reading, and stand upon the textus receptus. The exact words of Jerome, above referred to, are, "ut in Hebraeo legi potest, *et exsufflastis me*, haec dicendo, non sacrificio, sed, mihi cui sacrificabatis, fecistis injuriam." In support of this view, R. Sol. Isaaci is quoted by Buxtorf as saying: "In textu sacro fuisse scriptum אֹתִי et postea per Scribas correctum אֹתוֹ ut hodie legitur."² The expression as well as the idea contained in כ has, it cannot but be admitted, a tendency to awaken a revulsion of feeling in a sensitive reverential heart. Therefore, if the emendation was made, the motive that actuated it was good.

XV. Psalm cvi. 20.

(כ). "Thus they changed my glory (כְּבוֹדִי) into the similitude of an ox, that eateth herbage."

(ת). Thus they changed their glory (כְּבוֹדָם) into the similitude of an ox that eateth herbage."

The remarks under IX. will equally apply here, for the cases are almost identical. As a circumstance tending to show that a certain degree of uncertainty as to the true text, has from remote time existed, we may cite the fact, that the Vulgate here reads, *gloriam suam*, which is supported by some codices of the

¹ Commentary on the Minor Prophets, vol. II., p. 440.

² Lex., Rad., תִּקּוּן.

LXX. where we find *δόξαν αὐτοῦ*; both indicating a single suffix (כבוד). Consult the striking parallel in Rom. i. 23.

XVI. Job. vii. 20.

(כ). "If I have sinned, what *injury* can I cause unto thee, O thou Watcher of men? Why hast thou set me up as a target for thee *to strike at*, and *why* have I become a burden unto thee (עליך)."

(ת). The same except the last word which here reads: "unto myself (עלי)."

This is a case where the presumption raised, in favor of כ being the original reading, is very strong. The Septuagint so has it, *εἰμὶ δὲ ἐπὶ σοὶ φορτίον*; and many of the ablest critics have given their decision in its favor. We have space but to mention only one or two of the numerous authorities which have endorsed it. The eminent Jewish Commentator Ibn Ezra (1092-1167) adopts it as the original form written by the author. Houbigant, in his *Biblia Hebraica cum notis criticis*, 1753, says: "ואהיה עלי למשא etc., *sum mihi gravis*. Imo עליך *tibi*, quod scribae mutarent in עלי. Id vocant correctionem scribarum, h. e. תקון סופרים, quod indignum divina majestate arbitrantur ut homuncio Deo esset oneri. Sed num fuerunt sapientiores Deo? Haec Drusius, ex ipso Aben-Ezra Judaeo, qui sic aiebat: *correctio est scribarum licit expositio ejus absque correctione recta sit*." Sapienter vero id Aben-Ezra, cum עליך sui simile habeat לך in priori membro, et cum scriptum habuerint עליך Graeci interpretes." And in our day, such an able and conservative critic as Dr. Delitzsch feels himself constrained to accept this reading in preference to that of the Massora; he thus expresses his conviction: "Why, says Job, hast thou made me a mark of hostile attack, and why am I a burden to thee? It is not so in our text; but according to Jewish tradition, עלי, which we now have, is only a תקון סופרים *correctio scribarum*, for עליך, which was removed as bordering on blasphemy. This reading I should not consider as the original, in spite of the tradition, if it were not confirmed by the LXX."¹ In this he is followed by the Lange-Schaff Commentary. It does indeed seem as though it were only a matter of time before עליך would again obtain its due recognition and take its rightful place in the printed text. May we not with confidence assert that, when that much desired *critically revised Hebrew Text* shall appear, as appear it certainly must, this will be one of the corrections to be found incorporated in it.

XVII. Job. xxxii. 3.

(כ). "And against his three friends was his wrath kindled, because they had found no answer to Job and also because they had condemned divine justice (את הרין)."

(ת). "And against his three friends was his wrath kindled, because they had found no answer, and yet had condemned Job (את איוב)."

Tradition has preserved an alternative reading in כ, viz., את אלהים.

¹ Commentary on the Book of Job, translated by Bolton, 2d ed. 1886.

"God:" if this be adopted, the clause of course would be: "And also because they had condemned God." It is not indicated which is the more probably true reading. At any rate, the idea is evidently precisely the same, whichever term be employed.

Hitzig, though not giving his support to the traditional view (i. e., that the scribes have here made an emendation), still suggests that the reading אלהים may be the foundation for the rendering found in the LXX., *δοῦτο οὗτο ἡδυνήθησαν ἀποκριθῆναι ἀντίθετα Ἰώβ, καὶ ἔθεντο αὐτὸν εἶναι ἀσεβῆ.*¹ The reasonableness of the statement found in כ, as viewed in the light of other expressions met with in the poem, has been seriously attacked by some: e. g., Dr. Delitzsch peremptorily dismisses it with the remark, "According to the Jewish view, וירשעו את-איוֹב is one of the eighteen תקוני סופרים (*correctiones scribarum*), since it should be וירשעו את-אלהים. But it is not the friends who have been guilty of this sin of הרשיע against God, but Job, ch. XL 8, to whom Elihu opposes the sentence אל לא-ירשיע, ch. XXXIV. 12. Our judgment of another such *tikkun*, ch. VII. 20, was more favorable."²

This objection seems to us to be without solid foundation, and rests upon a strange misconception and failure to apprehend the true trend of the various arguments, nor is it sustained by the passages referred to as authorities when they are rightly construed; for ch. XXXIV. 12 is obviously addressed to the three friends, and not to Job, as it is most commonly interpreted; this is plainly indicated by the form of address employed in verses 2 and 10. This whole passage, as we take it, is a fervid discourse addressed to the three friends for the purpose of instructing them as to how they could and should have effectively answered Job, which they had undoubtedly in their arguments failed to do, and for which palpable failure Elihu's anger was excited against them. And ch. XL 8 does by no means preclude the idea that the three friends were guilty of condemning divine justice in their arguments, as is shown by the words employed by the Lord in the epilogue, where he explicitly censures them for *not having spoken of me the thing that is right* (ch. XLII. 7, 8). Now the statement here made manifestly presents an incongruity when considered in the light of the common interpretation as founded upon the reading את איוֹב in ch. XXXII. 3, to obviate which the translators of the LXX. here have made clearly an intentional correction and thereby bring into harmony these discordant statements (i. e., ch. XLII. 8, *οὐ γὰρ ἐλάλησατε ἀληθὲς κατὰ τοῦ θεράποντός μου Ἰώβ*); and what is quite remarkable, some MSS. of the Hebrew exhibit a like reading (i. e., בעבדִי את איוֹב *against my servant Job*);—all of which certainly tend to demonstrate the reasonableness of the reading found in כ.

¹ "Das Buch Hiob," 1874, Note b, page 240.

² "Commentary on the Book of Job," Bolton's translation, 2d ed., 1863.

Dr. Green has, with rare insight, detected and exposed the necessary logical result to which the argument of the three friends leads, when he says, "The friends undertook to justify God's providential dealings. The failure of their argument apparently leaves the divine proceedings open to censure and without any adequate vindication. . . . They had really inculpated the providence of God by their professed defense of it. By disingenuously covering up and ignoring its enigmas and seeming contradictions they had cast more discredit upon it than Job by honestly holding them up to the light. Their denial of its apparent inequalities was more untrue and more dishonoring to the divine administration, as it is in fact conducted, than Job's bold affirmation of them. Even his most startling utterances, wrung from him in his bewilderment and sore perplexity, were less reprehensible than their false statements and false inferences."¹ Viewed in this light, is it in anywise strange or unreasonable that the inspired writer should predicate of "the messenger of God, who came to plead God's cause," for such Elihu undoubtedly was, that "against his three friends was his wrath kindled, because they had found no answer to Job, and also because they had condemned divine justice"?

Moreover, if a *Tikkun Sopherim* is anything at all, it is one of two things: (1) a record of what the author actually wrote in a particular case; or, (2) a notice indicating what the ancient scribes considered the sense of the context naturally and logically demanded. If the former be true, then verily these critics have become wiser than the spirit of inspiration. And if the latter be true, then they certainly convict the Hebrew scribes of an egregious misunderstanding of an argument expressed in their own language, and what is more, contained in their so carefully studied Sacred Scriptures; which is indeed as improbable as that Dr. Delitzsch has discovered the *only* construction which can be put upon ch. XL. 8. It hardly needs mention, that the reason which might have influenced a scribe to consider a correction desirable, was the offensiveness of a statement implying that mortal man had audaciously condemned the infinitely wise and just God.

XVIII. Lamentations III. 19-21.

(כ). "O remember my wretched and forlorn condition, *it is* wormwood and gall. Yea, verily thou wilt remember, and thy soul will condescend unto me (ותשיח עלי נפשי): this I recall to my heart, therefore have I hope."

(ת). "O remember my wretched and forlorn condition, *it is* wormwood and gall. My soul indeed remembers, and is humiliated within me (ותשוח עלי נפשי); this I recall to my heart, therefore have I hope."

If, in this case ת be a correct translation of the Massoretic text, and such it most probably is, then there is even to the English reader, evidently a marked lack of cohesion between the clauses, and a painful want of logical concatenation

¹ "The Argument of the Book of Job unfolded," pages 245 and 519.

in the thought; while, on the other hand, the clearness and beauty of the idea brought out in **ב** cannot but awaken an involuntary sanction and approval in the mind of every candid reader. If it be a fact that an emendation has been incorporated into the text here, then, indeed, it is to be regretted; for great has been the loss sustained, through the over-zealousness of Hebrew scribes in removing a seeming offensive anthropomorphism, which resulted well nigh in an annihilation of the sense. But if this view seem to lack support, then by far the most reverential attitude to assume is, that the text, as we now possess it, has suffered corruption during the process of time. Such indeed, is the view entertained by eminent commentators, who have been prolific in suggesting various emendations. But, after all, what is more reasonable or natural than to adopt the suggestion supported by the oldest tradition, and which so beautifully and consistently removes all ambiguity.

In conclusion, we feel confident that we cannot do better than quote the judgments expressed upon the *Tikkun Sopherim* by two such eminent authorities as Eichhorn and Bleek. The former concludes from "the character of the readings" that "this recension took note only of certain errors which had crept into the text through transcribers, and which were corrected by collection of MSS.¹ The latter thus expresses himself: "It is usually assumed that the notes called *Tikkun Sopherim* were merely alterations of incorrect readings in many manuscripts, according to others which were more exact, and it is supposed, unquestionably, that the readings brought forward by the Sopherim, which are just those of our present MSS. and editions, were the genuine and original ones. But in what we find stated, there is nothing to the effect that they were emendations from other MSS.; thus, then, the question would arise how the readings set aside by the corrections of the Sopherim were introduced into MSS.; as from the nature of many of the readings, they could not have got in by mere accident. Partly from the statements of the Massorites, and partly from the nature of many of the readings set aside by the *Tikkun Sopherim* as compared with those introduced by the latter and now existing in the text, we are led to look upon the matter in the following way:—that in these passages there actually existed generally, or at least in most of the manuscripts in use, other readings which, because in some points of view they presented certain offensive or doubtful expressions, the Sopherim considered themselves justified in altering. Thus, in a critical point of view, these earlier readings which are specified as being altered, always deserve much attention, and at least in many cases, it may be really assumed with great probability that they are the original ones. It may, however, be assumed with probability, that these *correctiones scribarum* existed in ancient times, indeed before the date of the Talmud, and that it is only by accident that they are not

¹ Einleitung in das Alte Test., 1823, § 116.

expressly mentioned in the latter. But the fact that the knowledge of them was afterwards preserved serves as a direct proof of the anxiety that was shown as to the form of the text."¹

Our main purpose in the writing of this article has been (1) to attempt to demonstrate the fact that there was a cogent motive in each case, sufficient to induce the Sopherim to change the original text; and (2) to establish, by external as well as internal proof, the basis for the presumption that the original text has actually suffered corruption at the hands of the ancient scribes, if not in all, at least in some of the cases considered, whether we have succeeded in our object, or not, is a question to be decided by the verdict of each unprejudiced reader. If it be proven that the scribes have, in truth, made one single correction in the original writings in the places designated as *Tikkun Sopherim*, then their whole line of defense must fall to the ground; for it is no longer entitled to the least credence, and the value of each *Tikkun* must be determined solely by the weight of evidence in its favor, in each individual case, totally irrespective of any statements or explanations handed down by personally interested scribes. *Falsus in uno falsus in omnibus* is a well established principle of legal evidence for determining the credibility of witnesses, and it is equally applicable to the case in hand.

In closing, we have only to say that there has been, throughout this discussion, an honest intention to bring to light only the truth, and while so doing, to endeavor to be fair and just in the criticisms indulged in and the judgments expressed.

¹ Introduction to the O. T. translation of Venables, vol. II., p. 459.

A SYNOPSIS OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY BY BAR 'EBHRÂYÂ.

BY RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL, PH. D.,

Columbia College, New York City.

In his "Lamp of the Holy Things" Bar 'Ebhîrâyâ has given us a compendium of his logical, physical, metaphysical, and theological writings. In its general construction it is very similar to the "Book of the Bee" and to the "Causa Causarum" attributed to Ya'qubh 'Urhâyâ (ZDMG. xv. 648). The "M'nârath Kudhshê" is perhaps one of the least known of the larger works of Bar 'Ebhîrâyâ.¹ MS. copies of it are quite rare.² At some future date I hope to edit the whole of it. It is especially interesting as giving us a picture of the state of science in Syria during the thirteenth century. It furnishes also important additions to our Syriac lexicon, and has not been sufficiently excerpted by Quatremere for the "Thesaurus Syriacus." In a small publication, I have already edited the chapter on plants and their medicinal properties.³ The following contains the chapter on the Greek philosophers, taken from the Berlin MS. It is much more scientific than the accounts in the Syriac Chronicle and Arabic "Historia Dynastorum." I do not think that Bar 'Ebhîrâyâ has himself gone very deeply into Grecian philosophy. It is probably based upon some such synopsis as those of Aristotle in the first book of the "Metaphysics," Plutarch in Eusebius, "Prepar. Evan." xiv. 14, and Stobaeus, "Eclogae Physicae," i. 12. The names are written too correctly for it to have come from an Arabic source; though Bar 'Ebhîrâyâ has otherwise drawn largely from Ibn Abi Oseibia, El Kifti and Sa'id (Steinschneider, "Al Farabi," pp. viii, 152, 154, 157). In what connection this synopsis stands to one mentioned by Renan in his "Phil. Peripat. apud Syros" (Steinschneider, *loc. cit.*, p. 128) I am unable to say, as I have no means of consulting that book.

Through the kindness of Professor Sachau and Herr Stud. Müller in Berlin my copy has been once more collated with the MS.

MS. Sachau 81, fol. 22a.

[illegible]

¹ *Journal Asiatique*, 1834, p. 461, contains a description of the work. Assemâni (B. O. II. 234) does not say much. A short extract will be found in Frothingham's "Stephen bar Sudaili," p. 63.

² Vatican (B. O., *loc. cit.*), Paris (anc. fonds MS. 121), Berlin (Sachau MS. 81). Arabic translations exist in Paris, the British Museum, and the Bodleian.

³ "A List of Plants and their Properties," etc. Berlin, 1886. For private circulation only.

[illegible]

בְּחַסְדֵּי מַלְאָכָא וְעִסְתָּא, חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא מְדַבֵּר בְּחַסְדֵּי מַלְאָכָא
 חֲכָמָא . חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא
 חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא
 חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא
 חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא חֲכָמָא

Second foundation, on the nature of this universe. In it there are a preface and three chapters.

I. Preface. Many and different opinions were [current] among the ancients regarding the nature of this universe. For some of them assumed water to be the one moving principle, as Thales of Miletus,¹ he who first originated philosophy. For he saw that all life springs from the moisture of seed, and that all plants draw their nourishment from it, and by means of it grow; and that from [damp²] vapors fire, the sun, and the stars are nurtured. The poet Homer also sings (šabbah) in the same strain when he calls Oceanus and Tethys, i. e., the sea and moisture, the parents of all existing things.³ Others again have posited (τίθημι) air [as the first principle], as Anaximenes and Diogenes. They said that the soul of everything that lives is preserved by air; and that wind and air preserve this world.⁴ Others posited fire, as Hippasus, and Heraclitus and Theophrastus. They affirmed that it is heat which brings forth all things, and causes them to grow; and that, when this [fire] goes out, the world also ceases to be. Some of them posit one moving principle, as Xenophanes. This one denied all generation and destruction;⁵ and one affirms that the essence of all things is altogether unchangeable. Parmenides says that the principle [of all things] is *one*, immovable; but *one* only in the concept (λόγος).⁶ On this account he affirmed it to be limited. Milissus posits the *one*, identical in number and in substance. He affirmed it to be infinite. Some of them (i. e., the philosophers) assumed many elements. Of

¹ Through a clerical error MS. has "Melitene," the well-known city in Cappadocia; *Hist. Dynast.*, p. 50, correctly Miletus.

² Wabb^hlehgê dh^emayyâ? καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ θερμὸν ἐκ τούτου γιγνόμενον. Arist. *Metaph.* I. 3.

³ Il. XIV. 102: Ὠκεανὸν τε θεῶν γένεσιν, καὶ μητέρα Τηθύν. In his *Hist. Dynast.* Bar 'Ebhṛāyâ tells us that Theophilus of Edessa, who died in 785, translated Homer into Syriac (Lagarde, *Symmicta*, I. 106). Severus of Tegrit mentions it also (*ibid.*). Bar 'Alī (Payne Smith col. 2081) cites the expression "mayyâ dhaggâlê" probably from the same source. Cf. also Ibn Abi Useibia, I. 185, l. 25.

⁴ The words of Anaximenes himself. Stobæus, *Eclogarum physic.* I. 296: οἶον ἢ ψυχὴ ἢ ἡμετέρα ἀήρ οἷσα συγκρατεῖ ἡμᾶς καὶ ὅλον τὸν κόσμον πνεῦμα καὶ ἀήρ περιέχει.

⁵ Ξενοφάνης. οὔτε γένεσιν οὔτε φθορὰν ἀπολείπει. Freudenthal, *Ueber die Theologie des Xenophanes*, p. 46 Zeller, *A Hist. of Greek Phil.*, I. p. 586.

⁶ The sense here is very obscure. I think that Bar 'Ebhṛāyâ means Parmenides to say that the *one* is identical with itself. Zeller, I. c., p. 586.

these there were those who assumed infinite *ὁμοιομερῆ*, as Anaxagoras.¹ He said that when these parts (*μέρη*) collide with one another and again separate from one another, generation and destruction are completed. The active cause of existence he affirmed to be the *νοῦς*. Lucippus also assumed infinite elements, but [said] that they differ [from one another] and possess real Being, and that "Being is not more real than not-Being."² Democritus again assumes infinite principles round in form (*σχήμα*), which can be divided off mentally, not in reality. Epicurus, again, says of the [first] principles that they are infinite [in number], indivisible, and are set in motion in an infinite vacuum, and that they possess magnitude, shape and gravity.

Others posited the principles as finite, as Empedocles. This [philosopher] set up the four elements as principles, and the mingling (*μῖξις*) [of the elements], which is generation, he calls love (*φιλότης*), and [their] separation (*διάλλαξις*), which is destruction, [he calls hate (*νεῖκος*)].³ Aristotle posits three principles, *ὕλη*, *εἶδος* and deprivation (*στέρησις*).⁴ He also assumes elements for the *στέρησις*, because the destruction of every *εἶδος* is the cause of another *εἶδος*. The Stoics said that the Deity (*ὁ θεός*) and the *ὕλη* are the [material] principles, the one as working force (*τὸ ποιοῦν*) the other as passive (*τὸ πάσχον*) and receptive, i. e., father and mother. Some Stoics posited five elements,—god, the soul (*ψυχή*), *ὕλη*, time (*κρόνος*) and vacuum (*κενόν*).

Pythagoras, the son of Mnesarchus, the Samian, he who first gave the name *philosophy* to philosophy,⁵ made numbers the elements of this universe; saying that the compound numbers come from the simple ones, and that there is nothing simpler than number, because it is bereft of all nature, and that every nature, since number necessarily belongs to it, is compound,⁶ and not simple. He asserts, further, that the first number is the active force (*ποιητικόν*), and the second the receptive (*ὑλη*). The full number is ten (*δεκάς*), because it cannot be added to, but we [commence again to] count from it. The number four (*τετρακτὴς*) is its [i. e., ten's] foundation; for by means of it [the ten] is made full; namely, by [the addition of] one, and two, and three, and four. Atticus, in the first chapter of the book Philicus [Phillipus?] says that Plato thought [there were] four elements,—*νοῦς*, which is the active force, or deity, praise be to his goodness; the receptacle (*δοχεῖον*?) or *ὕλη*, which he also calls the receptive mother⁷ and *ἐκμαγεῖον*;⁸ the image

¹ Arist. *Metaph.* I. 3.

² Aristotle, *Metaph.* I. 4, of which our words are a translation: διὸ καὶ οὐθὲν μᾶλλον τὸ ὄν τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἶναι φασιν.

³ A clerical omission in MS.

⁴ Stobæus, *Eclogæ Physicæ*, I. ch. XII. Schahrastāni, "Kitāb al-Milal wan-Nihāl," II. 317. Aaron ben Elia, "ʿes hayyim," ed. Delitzsch, p. 326.

⁵ In the *Hist. Dynast.*, p. 51, this has become, "Some say that the first one who philosophized was Pythagoras."

⁶ In the MS. this word occurs twice; but see *Hist. Dynast.*, p. 84.

⁷ Timæus, 51 A.

⁸ Timæus, 50 D.

[of the thing generated, i. e., ἀφομοιούμενον] or εἶδος, which he calls the archetype, saying that in its likeness the different substances were created; and motion (κίνησις) or soul, which until then had existed without knowledge in the ἑλῆ as the first principle, and [which] had been brought into motion confusedly and not according to order (ἀτάκτως).¹ In the book *Timæus*, Plato himself says that these [principles] are three,—being, δοχεῖον, and νοῦς, a treble triad, and [one which] existed before the heavens.² Moreover, he called εἶδος God,³ and δοχεῖον ἑλῆ; motion or soul [he called] generation. And in one place also he says there are two principles, combining the deity and εἶδος into one, and ἑλῆ and motion into one. Syrianus (MS. Sibaricus?), to whom Plotinus attached himself, and Boëthus (MS. BUTUS), to whom Longinus (MS. LUKGS), the teacher of Porphyrius, was attached, have said much about the opinions of Plato; but we omit them, in order that this exposition be not prolonged. Of the rest, Bardaisân posited five principles or beings,⁴—fire, and wind, and water, and light, and darkness; Mani, however, only two,—goodness and evil.⁵ And because all these profane [writers] attributed eternity and not generation to this world, being in opposition to the holy church, which does not attribute to it eternity, but generation, i. e., temporal beginning, holding its generation to be true, but denying its eternity, we refute them in a body, as we do all their frightful doctrines. A separate treatise, however, is necessary against every one of these heresies on a larger scale than in this writing.

¹ *Timæus*, 69 B, ταῦτα ἀτάκτως ἔχοντα ὁ θεός, κτλ.

² *Timæus*, 52 D, ὃν τε καὶ χώραν καὶ γένεσιν εἶναι τρία τριχῇ καὶ πρὶν οὐρανὸν γενέσθαι.

³ Read, "kârê 'allâbâ lâdhšâ."

⁴ Cureton, *Spic. Syr.*, p. 3, etc. Cf. also Payne Smith, s. v. "Schahrastâni," I. 104; Aaron ben Elia, p. 310; Bardesanes von Edessa von Dr. A. Merx, Halle, 1863; Bardesanes der Letzte Gnostiker, Leipzig, 1864; W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in early Arabia*, p. 220; Flügel, *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften*, p. 161. MS. or. Berlin Sachau 302 contains a short extract from Bardaisân. Aprêṃ, however (B. O. I. 131), has *seven* instead of *five*.

⁵ Titus von Bostra, ed. Lagarde, 6:1. Flügel, *loc. cit.*, p. 177.

S. J. FINN'S NEW HEBREW DICTIONARY.

BY RABBI B. FELSENTHAL, PH., D.,

Chicago, Ill.

This dictionary may be designated not only as very interesting and instructive, but as quite unique in its character. Its full title is given below.¹

Of this book which is now in the course of being published in the city of Warsaw, five numbers, each containing eighty pages, have reached me. These five numbers comprise the words from the letter א to the word נגב. The work will be completed in twenty numbers. The book is written throughout in an easy and flowing neo-hebraic language, and no exceedingly great Hebrew learning is required in order to be able to use this dictionary.

But what is there so unique in this book? the reader may ask. Have we not already a very large number of Hebrew dictionaries? Have not very many such been written during the last thousand years? At no time was there a lack of this kind of literature, since the days when Jehudah ben 'Alan, of Tiberias (died in the year 932), wrote his lexicon,² and since soon after him Jehudah Ibn Qoreish composed his "*Iggaron*,"³ down to the present day in which Friedrich Delitzsch is preparing a new Hebrew dictionary which is looked for with great expectations by the friends of Hebrew philology. (For, according to all that we learn of the forthcoming work of Delitzsch, it will, in all likelihood, mark a decided progress in Hebrew lexicography.) What, then, is there so unique in Finn's book? Is it the circumstance that it is composed in Hebrew? But we have also *such* dictionaries, and quite a number of them.⁴

Our answer is: Finn is the first one who has undertaken to give us a complete thesaurus of the *entire* Hebrew language. All other Hebrew dictionaries—I speak only of *Hebrew* dictionaries, and not of Aramaic or Talmudic dictiona-

האוצר¹

אוצר לשון המקרא והמשנה, כולל פתרון כל המלות שנמצאו במקרא ובמשנה באור הנחותיהן הראשונות וההוראות הנגזרות מהן, והברלי השמות והפעלים הנרדפים, ועם זה זכרון המלות הנגזרות מלשון המקרא והמשנה, שבאו בתלמודים, במדרשי ההלכות וההגדות, בפיוטים ובספרי גדולי חכמי ישראל האחרונים, והעתקתם ללשון רוססית ואשכנזית, וכן כל שמות העצמים הפרטים שזכרו במקרא. חֲבֵר מֵאֵת ר' שְׁמוּאֵל יוֹסֵף פִּין נ"י מוויילנא, יוצא לאור על ידנו נפתלי משכיל-לאיתן ואברהם צוקקערמאנן. ווארשא, שנת תרמ"ו לפ"ק.

² About him and his grammatical and lexical works see Pinsker's *Liqqutē Qadmoniyyoṯ*, I., 106; also Geiger in "Oṣar Nehmad," II., 158, reprinted in his *Hebr. Abhandlungen*, p. 32.

³ See Pinsker, *loc. cit.*, p. 108. In a passage to be found in his *Risalet* and quoted by Pinsker, Qoreish himself mentions that he wrote a dictionary; comp. also M. Jastrow, above page 105.

⁴ Among these Hebrew dictionaries, written in Hebrew and published within a comparatively recent time, probably the best known is the "Oṣar ha-Shorashim," by J. Benzeeb (*vulgo Bensaw*), the first edition of which appeared in Vienna, in 1807.

ries—gather in only the *Wortschatz* of the Hebrew Bible, and leave Mishnah, Mekhila, Sifra, Sifre, Beraithoth, etc., entirely unnoticed. But our author does not restrict himself to that part of the Hebrew, of which, accidentally, roots and stems have been preserved in the Old Testament. He defines and explains also those Hebrew words which are not found in the Bible. And there are a large number of such Hebrew roots in that part of the post-biblical literature of the Jews which dates from the apostolic age and the first centuries of the Christian era. There are still larger and still more extensive numbers of new *derivations*, formed from these Hebrew roots and stems, which were coming into common use in the Hebrew literature of the Jews in all later ages. Such new word-formations are coined even by Hebrew writers in our present age,—often, it must be admitted, very clumsily and really un-Hebrew, but often also very happily and quite in harmony with the genius of the Hebrew language.

The want of such a *complete* thesaurus has been felt for a long time. Zunz, more than thirty years ago, in an article containing "*Wuensche fuer ein Woerterbuch der Hebr. Sprache*,"¹ declared this to be a great fault and neglect in our Hebrew dictionaries that they are so narrow and limited in their scope, and he thought it not more than right and proper that the lexicographers should take notice also of the Hebrew as it was spoken and written after the canonical books of the O. T. had been collected. And now what this master was looking for thirty years ago, is gradually being realized.

We are probably not in error when we suppose that to many readers of *HEBRAICA*, the post-biblical Hebrew literature is an unexplored and not much-known field. It may, therefore, not be out of place if we use this occasion for trying to convey here, by a few illustrations and examples, an idea of the post-biblical Hebrew,—not of its grammatical structure, for this would require a special article, or series of articles, but of its lexical peculiarities and distinctions.

It has been said above that in the Mishnah and its cotemporary Hebrew literature Hebrew roots and stems are found which accidentally are not to be met with in the Hebrew Bible. Let us give some such roots as are not to be found in Gesenius, Fürst, or any dictionary of the Hebrew Bible.

בגר, to enter into a riper age, used especially of females; derivatives: בוגרת a maiden; בגרות the mature state of womanhood, etc.

ברח to amuse, to make merry; derivatives: ברחן a jester; בריחות or ברחנות amusement, entertainment, etc.

דק (compare the bibl.-Hebrew דק, דקק) to be strict; derivatives: מדויק exact; מדיק strictness, close examination; reduplicated: מדקדק, מדוקדק to take it, or to be taken, strictly; רקדוק exact knowledge, science of grammar, etc.

פסר (not used in Qäl), הפסיד to cause damage; הפסר loss, damage, etc.

¹ See *Zeitschr. d. Deutsch-Morgenland. Gesellsch.*, vol. X., (1856) p. 501 sq.; reprinted in Zunz' *Ges. Schriften* vol. III., p. 14, sq.

צער *pain, suffering, affliction*; **מצער** *one who causes pain or trouble, etc.*
תרה *to warn*; **התראה** *warning, etc.*

The list could be easily enlarged. That these words are pure and genuine Hebrew, and were used not only by the apostles and their cotemporaries, but also in pre-Christian times, there can be no rational doubt.

Another class of neo-Hebraic words are those which in later ages were derived from, and formed out of, such roots as already occurred in the Bible. For instance:

חליצה *the act of releasing a man from the duty of marrying his widowed sister-in-law*, (see Dt. xxv. 5 seq.), derived from **חליץ** *to draw off*; **חלוצה** *the widow thus released, etc.*

יבמות *the leviratical status* (see Dt. *ibid.*), derived from **יבם** *the levir, brother-in-law*. This word **יבמות** is also the title of one of the tractates in the Talmud, and is usually read "Yebamoth." Joseph Derenbourg, however, a few years ago, advanced the idea, and supported it by good arguments, that it would be more correct to read "Yabmuth."

גר in the Bible, *the stranger who dwells with us*, from the root **גור** *to dwell*; in post-biblical literature *the proselyte*; therefrom the derivations **גִּיר**, **התגיר**, *to make, or to become, a proselyte*; **גרות** *proselytism*; **גיורת** *a female proselyte, etc.*

הבדלה *distinction* (from **בדל**); *the benediction spoken on the close of the Sabbath*, in which God is praised "who makes a distinction between the holy Sabbath-day and the profane week-days," etc.

מסורת *Massoreth*, or **מסורה** *Masorah* (from **מסר** *to transmit*),—technical terms for the traditions concerning the orthography of the original text of the Bible and what is connected therewith.

הלכה, *Halakhah*, the rule, the religious law or enactment (from **הלך** *to go*).¹

הגדה or **אגדה** *Haggadah, Agadah*, (from **נגד**, *Hiph'il to announce, to tell*), the non-Halakhic parts of the Talmud (sentences, maxims, parables, narratives, homiletical explanations and amplifications of biblical passages, etc.).

מבוא in the Mishnah **מבוי**, *a court before a house, an entrance into a house*; in later periods, *an introduction into some branch of learning*.

מחט *needle*; **חייט** *a tailor*. In the Bible we find only **חוט** *the thread*.

¹ I cannot forego to submit here to the consideration of those of my readers who are more conversant with the New Testament and its exegesis than I claim to be, the following thought. In the Gospel according to St. John, xvi. 6, we read: Jesus said unto Thomas, "I am the way, the truth, and the life," etc.—"I am the way,"—what does this mean? Let us re-translate it into the language of the educated Jews in Jesus' times, and we will find that Jesus probably said, **אנכי ההלכה** "I am the Halakhah (the law), etc., and no man cometh to the Father but by me." Now the sentence becomes much clearer, and expresses an idea which is in full harmony with the theology of the Fourth Gospel. But what good sense can be connected with the words "I am the way?" In looking into the excellent Hebrew translation of the New Testament by Prof. Franz Delitzsch, I notice that the words under consideration are rendered there by **אנכי הדרך**,—and this, I must confess, causes me rather hesitation in regarding my rendering as correct. However, it may be worth examination by experts.

רִאִיָּה the argument; **רִאִיָּה** the faculty of seeing; **רִאִיוֹן** the act of appearing before God in the Temple; (see Dt. xvi. 16); **רָאִי** to be fit or proper (from the verb **ראה** to see).

A **רב מיבהק** is a celebrated or illustrious teacher. **מובהק**, from **בהק** to shine; see the biblical *ἀπαξ λεγόμενον* **בֹּהֶק** a white spot, Lev. xiii. 39.

תקון, **תקנה** an institution, a firmly established rule; **מתוקן** to be ready, established; derived from **תקן**, which is three times found in Ecclesiastes.

כוֹן (from biblical **כוֹן**) to direct the attention; therefrom **כוֹנֵה** attention, devotion.

חֲזַן (from biblical **חזה** to see) the overseer; in the Mishnah, **חֲזַן הכנסת** the overseer of the synagogue; later, the reader, or the conductor of divine service.

עבודה, which in the Bible means *manual work*, or *bodily labor*, signifies in later times, *service in the temple*; and afterwards *divine service* in general.

And thus could we multiply these examples by the hundreds; we could enumerate whole pages full of such neo-hebraic word-formations, as **עברה**, **תרם** (from **תרומה**, and this from **רום**), **תחיה**, **סעודה**, **אנינות**, **אכלות**, **כנסיה**, **היתר**, **הרגל**, **תלמיד**, **תבשיל**, **ברירה**, **התחלה**, **הכנסה** or **כנסת**, **כחגיגה**, etc., etc.

All these word-formations and derivatives, given above, occur already in the literature of the Talmudical age. But the Jewish authors in all subsequent ages coined new words, as necessity required, from the old roots. A furtive glance into the liturgical poetry of the synagogue (the *Piyyutim*) which originated in the middle ages makes us acquainted with a vast number of such new formations. (Zunz, in the appendices to his *Synagogale Poesie*, furnishes several lists of such new enrichments of the store of Hebrew terms by the *Payyetanim*.) So we find a peculiar class of metaphysical Hebrew terms in the writings of the many Jewish metaphysicians and theologians of these mediæval times,—which, of course, had to be coined anew. For, who before *Saadia Gaon*, in the tenth century, wrote on systematic theology or on speculative philosophy? **הכרח** the necessity; **בחירה** freedom of will; **אפשרות** possibility; **ישות** being, existing; **מהות** the what, quality; **כמות** the how-many, quantity; **איכות** the how; **אחדות** the oneness; **ייחוד** monotheism; **קדמות** priority; **השארת הנפש** immortality of the soul, etc.; such are some of these abstract philosophical terms.

While **קודם**, **מוקדם** etc. (comp. biblical **קֶדֶם**, **קֶדֶם**) are found already in the more ancient post-biblical literature, we find in later periods **הקדמה** preface; **קדימה** (e. g. **כסף קדימה** payment in advance), etc. In our own times Hebrew writers have given currency to such words as **ספרות** literature; **יהדות** Judaism, and so forth.

Let us now, after these illustrations from the peculiar *Sprachgut* belonging to the realm of the neo-hebraic language and literature, return to Finn's *Thesaurus*. In general, we must say that the author is perfectly competent and

qualified for his work, and that in the main he is fully reliable. Yet, in a few instances, it seems that some stems have been overlooked, or that some other stems are somewhat defectively defined and admit of corrections. Thus, e. g., under **אָדוּם** the author states correctly that in the Talmudical literature "Edom" was used as a typical name for the Roman empire, but he forgot to add that at a later time, after the city of Rome had become the center and capital of the Christian world, "Edom" was also used to designate Christendom. In some connections "Edom" means the language of Rome, the Latin language (see, e. g., Jehudah Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew translation of Jehudah ha-Levi's *Cozari*, II., 77: **לֹא בְעֵרָב נֶאֱדָרִים וְלֹא בְעֵרָב** = neither in the Latin, nor in the Arabic language).

Strange it is that the author forgot to state that the noun **אָוֶר** is, in some instances, to be translated by *the eve* (preceding a certain day). In this sense the word is used in the very beginning of the Mishnah Pesahim.

Under the stem **בָּטָא**, resp. **מִכְטָא**, mention should have been made that with some philosophical writers **חִכְמַת הַמִּכְטָא** means the *science of logic* or of *dialectics*.

S. v. **בֵּית** the author gives a list of seven various definitions, for which the word stands in the Bible and in the later Hebrew literature. He might have added an eighth definition; he might have informed us that **בֵּית** means also in some connections a *stanza* or a *verse* in poetry.

גָּלַח to shave off, to shear. Under this article the author mentions correctly the Mishnaic abstract nouns derived from it: **גְּלוּחַ** and **תְּגֻלְחָתָא**. But he does not mention the word **גִּלְחָן**, used in post-talmudical times, a *monk* (literally, a *shorn one*, one who wears a tonsure), and the word **גִּלְחוּת**, derived therefrom, the *monkdom*, also sometimes the language of the monks, the *Latin*, etc.

But it is perhaps too early to expect in our days a perfect and complete thesaurus, which should comprise *all* the words of the Hebrew found in the large post-biblical literature of the Jews, and which should give *all* the meanings and shades of meanings in which these words have been used by various authors and in various times. A number of smaller lexical works, collecting and arranging the words used by certain authors, or in certain special branches of learning, ought first to be written and published before a full and complete thesaurus can possibly be undertaken. The field is too large and as yet not as much explored as it ought to be. It would, therefore, be well if, for instance, one would undertake to extract from the grammatical works of the mediæval grammarians their peculiar grammatical terms and to explain them; and if he would thereby furnish us a glossary in which the words **מַלְכִּים**, **מִשְׁרָתִים**, **נְקוּדוֹת**, **תְּנוּעוֹת**, **טַעֲמִים**, **חֲרוּזִים**, **יָתֵד**, **דִּלְת**, **סוּגֵר**, **בִּנְיָן**, **מִשְׁקַל**, etc., would be properly defined. So we ought to have, as a preliminary work, a neo-hebraic philosophical glossary; also a glossary explaining medical, mathematical, astronomical and other scientific terms. Even in the historical Hebrew literature of the mediæval and mod-

ern Jews we meet words which to the beginner must be puzzling, though they are seemingly so easy. What, for instance, is to be understood by זָהוּבִים, or by פְּרָחִים? Not every one will know that these words are translations of the European words *Gulden* and *Florins*; or that the word זַעִירִים is the neo-hebraic equivalent for *Minorites*, etc., etc.

But after all, despite some shortcomings, Finn's book is highly commendable.

NOTES ON PSALM LXXIV. 4, 5.

BY REV. F. H. WOODS, B. D.,

Theological Lecturer at St. John's College, Oxford, England.

The difficulty of these verses has been recognized by all commentators; and it is not my intention to discuss the many explanations which have been offered. I merely wish to propose a solution of a different kind by what appears a simple and well-warranted emendation of the text. If the suggestion has already been made by others and rejected, your readers will, I hope, pardon my ignorance. Now it is certainly noticeable that the chief difficulties lie in the word אֲתוֹת closing verse 4, and יוֹדֵעַ beginning verse 5. Leave out these words and the whole passage is quite intelligible. It runs as follows: "Thy enemies have roared in the midst of thy congregations, they have set up their signs (i. e., probably heathen idols). As one lifteth axes on high upon a thicket of trees, so now all the carved work together with hatchets and hammers do they break down." On the other hand, these two words, if read, give us two expressions clumsy, unparalleled, and, in spite of all the labor expended upon them, of very doubtful meaning. This is all the more remarkable, when we consider that otherwise the style of the psalm is vigorous, graphic and lucid. We should not, of course, be justified in rejecting these words on the ground already given, were it not that in this case we can trace a very probable source of interpolation. In the ninth verse we find these same words at the beginning and the end of the verse. The only differences are that the first has the additional suffix יִנֵּן, and the last, according to the Massoretic text, is pointed by different vowels. In the Massoretic text also the words, עֵר-מָה are joined by Mer'kha to יוֹדֵעַ, and this certainly gives a fair sense; but it would suit the parallelism and the context better to take יוֹדֵעַ absolutely as a synonym of נִבִּיאַ. What the Psalmist complains of is that religious worship and religious teaching have been alike suppressed. The words עֵר-מָה may have originally preceded עֵר-מָתִי as the beginning of the new sentence of verse 9; or are more probably an interpolation arising out of עֵר-מָתִי, a cause of interpolation so frequent in all languages that it is not necessary to quote parallelisms. Such an interpolation would have been favored by the ambiguity of construction very similar to what we meet in verse 4, where the words בִּקְרַב מוֹעֵדֶךָ may be taken either with the first or the second clause of the verse. Those who repeated the psalm, or heard it repeated, being very familiar with the sound of עֵר-מָה immediately after יוֹדֵעַ might, not unnaturally, have associated these words in sense and so have unconsciously introduced the interpolation. This view seems to have the support of the LXX. The final ἐτι of verse 9 is, as the parallel ἐτι of the first

clause shows, not so likely a translation of ער-מה as of an עוד which naturally enough arose out of the ער at the beginning of verse 10. Now, if ער-מה is an interpolation, or should be taken with ער-מתי, then the words אתותינו יודע inclose the whole of verse 9, and is it not extremely likely that the words אתות יודע of verses 4, 5, represent an abbreviation of this verse? There are two obvious ways in which these words may have become interpolated in verses 4, 5. Either they were originally a marginal gloss, something of the nature of a note, intended to illustrate or explain the use of אתות; or far more probably they point to a difference of position in very early MSS., that is to say, the scribe simply wished to point to the fact that in some copy or copies he found this verse standing between 4 and 5. The transposition from verse 9 to the end of verse 4 may have arisen even unintentionally, the contrast between אתותם and אתותינו causing their juxtaposition. That verses got sometimes so transposed we have positive evidence in Ps. xxxviii. 21, 22, compared with 2 Kgs. xx. 7, 8. But we probably have a more remarkable parallel to the supposed transposition in this psalm in Ps. xviii. 13, 14, cf. 2 Sam. xxii. 13, 14. Here, if we had the psalm alone we should be inclined to suppose that the phrase ברר ונחלי אש was genuine in verse 14, and not in verse 13. But a comparison with the LXX. and Samuel shows that the reverse was more nearly the case. The true history of the variant appears to be as follows. The original reading in verse 13 was probably as in Samuel מנגה נגרו בערו נחלי אש. By transposition of letters בערו became עברו, and this latter word gave rise to the two variants עביו and בררו which eventually found their way into the text. Of this origin of עביו there can be little doubt; it is possible, however, that בררו, as one word, may have originally been substituted as a synonym of עברו, but this does not affect the main contention. In either case we get by conflation the present reading of verse 13 in Ps. xviii. supported in this stage by the LXX. version of the psalm.¹ But now the last words ברר ונחלי אש became little intelligible (as a bright sky, not "hailstones and coals of fire," would be the natural result of the passing away of the clouds), and they were transposed to the end of the next verse, where they suited the context better. The present text of the psalm represents the final stage of text in which the position found in MSS. before and after the transposition is combined. The only difference between this case and Psalm Lxxiv. is that here the repeated clause, which is very short, appears twice in full; in the latter case it is abbreviated in verses 4 and 5.

¹ The LXX. does not read these words in Ps. xviii. 14, in Samuel it agrees with the Hebrew text.

GENESIS II. 25 AND XLVIII. 10.

BY REV. JOHN EDWARDS,

Wheelock, Indian Territory.

1. I take Past and Future to be the primary significations of the two tenses in Hebrew. I therefore adhere to the old nomenclature, Preterite and Future.

2. From these primary significations are derived various ideas and relations which the tenses are used to express.

3. When used to express any of these derived notions, the time to which it belongs, whether Past, Present or Future, as in the case of the Participle or the Infinitive, is wholly indicated by the connection.

4. Some of these derivations are as follows :

FROM THE PRETERITE.

- I. Antecedence, or Relative Past.
- II. Causality.
 - 1. Cause.
 - 2. Reason.
 - 3. Adversative: though, notwithstanding, whereas.

FROM THE FUTURE.

- I. Sequence, or Relative Future.
- II. Result.
 - 1. Of Cause.
 - 2. Of Reason.
 - 3. Adversative: yet, nevertheless.

By *adversative* I mean that, from some cause, reason or condition, or from some statement, a certain result might be expected; but such is not the case, or the contrary or an entirely different one issues. That cause, reason or condition is, in Hebrew, often put in the Preterite, while the Future is used to point out a result different from, or opposite to, the one which might be expected. The Preterite throws the adversative stress on the protasis, indicated in English by *though*, *notwithstanding*, *whereas*; e. g., though I went, I did not get there. The Future in like use throws the stress on the apodosis, indicated in English by *yet*, *nevertheless*; e. g., I went, yet I did not get there.

Gen. II. 25 belongs here. "They were both naked." The *result* naturally expected is that they would be ashamed. But they were not. With this precisely corresponds 1 Kgs. I. 1, "They covered him with clothes, yet he gat no heat." Ez. XXIV. 12, "So they cried, yet I would not hear" (the Future of the protasis as frequentative Past).

This will account for the Future in Is. XLV. 4, the clauses being inverted. "I surnamed thee, though thou knewest me not" = Thou knewest me not, yet I surnamed thee. Ps. LXXIII. 22, with ׀, "Yet my heart was embittered, and I was pricked in my reins." In the form of Waw conv. Pret. = Waw with Future separated, Ps. L. 21, "These things thou didst, yet I held my peace."

According to statement 3 above, examples in present time would illustrate the principle equally well. They are comparatively numerous. I will only refer to 2 Sam. xiv. 14b; Is. xii. 1; Jer. viii. 12 (with יְבֹרֵךְ); Ezek. xviii. 14; Ps. l. 12; Job xix. 4, 22.

GENESIS XLVIII. 10.

The Hebrew has three ways of expressing possibility and ability. *a.* By the use of יָכֹל followed by the Infinitive, often with the preposition לְ. *b.* By the Future tense. This is one of its derived uses. *c.* By a combination of the two, i. e., the Future of יָכֹל, the future form reinforcing the essential idea of the verb.

The first requires no remark. As to the second, see Driver, § 37. There are numerous instances of the third in present time, e. g., Gen. xxxiv. 14; Exod. xviii. 18; Num. xxii. 37; Deut. i. 9; 1 Sam. xvii. 33; Is. lvii. 20; Jer. vi. 10; Am. vii. 10; Hab. i. 13; Ps. cxxxix. 6; Prov. xxx. 21; Job. xlii. 2; Lam. i. 14; Ec. viii. 17.

According to statement 3, it may equally as well be used of Past time. Under this belong Gen. xlviii. 10; Josh. vii. 12; xv. 63 seq.; Jer. xliv. 22; Ezek. xlvii. 5; Hos. v. 13; Job xxxi. 23; 2 Chron. xxxii. 15a, and, in the sense of lawfulness, according to the customs of the country, Gen. xliii. 32.

OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES MESSIANICALLY APPLIED BY THE ANCIENT SYNAGOGUE.

BY REV. B. PICK, PH. D.,

Allegheny City, Pa.

IV.

ISAIAH.

XXX. 18. "And therefore will the Lord wait, that he may be gracious unto you," etc.

Rabbi Samuel, the son of Nachmani, said that Rabbi Jonathan said: May the bones of those who compute the latter days (when the Messiah shall appear) be blown away; for some say, Because the time has come and himself has not, therefore he will never come! But wait thou for him, for it is said: "Though he tarry, wait for him" (Hab. II. 3). Perhaps you will say, We wait, but he does not wait; learn rather to say: "And therefore will the Lord wait, that he may be gracious unto you," etc.—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 97, col. 2.

— 25. "And there shall be upon every high mountain, and upon every high hill rivers and streams of waters," etc.

Rabbi Eleazar, the son of Rabbi Hayim, said: All that Abraham did unto the ministering angels, God has repaid to his children at their exodus from Egypt, and will repay yet to them in the future. You find by Abraham: "Let a little water, I pray you, be fetched" (Gen. XVIII. 4), and God repaid it to his children (as it is said): "And I will take you to me for a people" (Exod. VI. 7), where "I will take you to me" stands against "Let, I pray, be fetched." Rabbi Jochanan said, "To me" denotes in this world; but whence (is it proved that it refers also) to the future! (From) "And the people shall take them and bring them to their place" (Isa. XIV. 2). Of Abraham it is written "a little water;" but God gave his children water at their exodus from Egypt, (as is seen from) "and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it" (Exod. XVII. 6). And how is it proved that it shall also be so in the future? From "for the Lord thy God bringeth thee into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills" (Deut. VIII. 4). And how is it proved that it shall also be so in the days of the Messiah? From "and there shall be upon every high mountain, and upon every high hill, rivers and streams of water," and "I will open rivers in high places" (Isa. XLI. 18).—*Midrash on Numbers* VII. 48, sect. 14.

- 26. "Moreover the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun."

This verse is quoted as presenting the Messianic age in *Talmud Pesachius*, fol. 68, col. 1; *Sanhedrin*, fol. 91, col. 2. God said to them (Bezaleel and Moses), You have made a candlestick before me, but in the future I will light a sevenfold larger light, as it is said, "Moreover, the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun.—*Midrash on Exodus xxxvii. 1*, sect. 50.

- XXXII. 20. "That send forth thither the feet of the ox and the ass."

What is the meaning of "but thou shalt in any wise let the dam go"? (Deut. xxii. 7). It is to indicate that, by observing this commandment, you will hasten the coming of the King Messiah, of whom also the word "send forth" is written. Whence is this proved? It is said, "That send forth thither the feet of the ox and the ass.—*Midrash on Deuteronomy xxii. 7*, sect. 6.

- XXXV. 5, 6. "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing," etc.

Come and see; all that the Holy One has wounded in this world he will heal in the future. The blind shall be healed; for it is said, "The eyes of the blind shall be opened." The lame shall be healed; for it is said, "Then shall the lame man leap as an hart." The dumb shall be healed; as it is said, "And the tongue of the dumb sing."—*Midrash on Genesis xlv. 28*, sect. 85; *Yalkut on 1 Sam. xxviii. 24*.

The word "then" (אז) may refer to the past and to the future. To the latter refers "then thou shalt see and flow together" (Isa. lx. 5); "then shall thy light break forth as the morning" (*ibid.* lviii. 8); "then the eyes of the blind," etc.; "then shall the lame man leap," etc.—*Yalkut on Joshua x. 12*.

- XL. 1. "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God."

When the word of Joseph had such a soothing effect upon the hearts of the tribes, how much more will be the effect when the Holy One, blessed be he! will come to comfort Jerusalem; as it is said, "Comfort ye, comfort ye," etc.—*Midrash on Genesis l. 21*, sect. 100.

- 5. "And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together," etc.

On Leviticus xli. the Midrash remarks: Rabbi Phinehas said, in the name of Rabbi Hoshaya, this parable: A king showed himself to the son of his house in his true likeness; for in this world the shechinah appears to individuals; but in the future the glory of the Lord will appear; as it is said, "And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed," etc.—*Midrash on Leviticus i. 1*, sect. 1.

- 10. "Behold, the Lord God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him; behold, his reward is with him," etc.

And on account of the sufferings which Israel suffered, will the Holy One,

blessed be he! give them a double reward in the days of the Messiah; for it is said, "Behold, the Lord God will come," etc.—*Yalkut on Exodus xxxii. 6.*

XLI. 18. See under XXX. 25.

— 25. "I have raised up one from the north, and he shall come," etc.

This verse is Messianically applied in the Midrash, where it is said, "When the Messiah rises, who is in the north, and comes to rebuild the sanctuary, which is in the south; for it is said, "I have raised up one from the north," etc.—*Midrash on Numbers vii. 12, sect. 13.*

— 27. "The first shall say to Zion," etc.

The name of the Messiah is "the First," as the Prophet says, "The first shall say to Zion," etc.—*Talmud Pesachim, fol. 5, col. 1.*

Rabbi Haggai said, in the name of Rabbi Isaac: It is said, The first (came out red, Gen. xxv. 25), on account of the first day; (as it is said) "And ye shall take you on the first day" (Lev. xxiii. 40), i. e., in the merit of the first day I will reveal myself to you as the first; as it is said, "I am the first, and I am the last" (Isa. xliv. 6), and, I will get you satisfaction from the first, i. e., Esau; for it is written, "And the first came out red" (Gen. xxv. 25); and, I will build you the first, i. e., the temple; as it is written, "A glorious high throne from the beginning is the place of our sanctuary" (Jer. xvii. 12), and, Bring you the First, i. e., the King Messiah, of whom it is written, "The first shall say to Zion," etc.¹—*Midrash on Genesis xxv. 24, sect. 63.*

XLII. 1. "Behold my servant, whom I uphold."

Targum: Behold my servant, the Messiah, I will bring him near.

XLIII. 10. "And my servant, whom I have chosen."

Targum: And my servant, the Messiah, in whom I am well pleased.

LII. 3. "Ye were sold for nought; but ye shall be redeemed without money."

Rabbi Eleazar says: If Israel would repent, they would be redeemed; as it is said, "Return, ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings" (Jer. iii. 22). Rabbi Joshua said unto him: Has it not been already said, "Ye were sold for nought, but ye shall be redeemed without money"? "Ye were sold" among the idolaters; but ye shall be redeemed without money, i. e., without repentance and good works.—*Talmud Sanhedrin, fol. 97, col. 2.*

— 7. "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings."

In the hour when the Holy One, blessed be his name! redeems Israel, three days before Messiah, comes Elijah, and stands upon the mountains of Israel and weeps and mourns for them, and says to them, Ye mountains of the land of Israel, how long shall you stand in a dry and desolate land? And his voice is heard from the world's end to the world's end, and after that he says to

¹ In similar connection our passage is quoted in *Midrash on Leviticus xxxiii. 40, sect. 30; Pesikta* (ed. Buber), p. 185, col. 2.

them: Peace has come to the world, peace has come to the world; as it is said, "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings," etc. And when the wicked hear it, they rejoice, and they say one to the other: Peace has come to us. On the second day he shall stand upon the mountains of Israel and shall say: Good has come to the world, good has come to the world; for it is said, "that bringeth good tidings of good." On the third day he shall come and stand upon the mountains of Israel, and say: Salvation has come to the world, salvation has come to the world; for it is said, "that publisheth salvation." And when he will see the wicked say so, he will say unto Zion, "thy God reigneth."—*Yalkut in loco.*

- 13. "Behold, my servant shall deal prudently; he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high."

Targum: Behold, my servant, the Messiah, shall prosper; he shall be exalted, etc. "Behold, my servant shall deal prudently." This is the King Messiah. "He shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high." He shall be exalted more than Abraham; for of Him it is written, "I have exalted my hand to the Lord" (Gen. xiv. 22). He shall be extolled more than Moses; for of Him it is written, "Thou sayest unto me, Extol (i. e., carry) them in thy bosom" (Num. xi. 12). And he shall be higher than the ministering angels; for it is said: "As for their rings, they were so high" (Ezek. i. 18). And thus it is said, "Who art thou, O great mountain?" (Zech. iv. 7), i. e., that is greater than the fathers. "But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed" (Isa. liii. 5). Rav Huna, in the name of Acha, said: The chastisements (or afflictions) were divided into three parts—one to David and the fathers; and one to the rebellious generations; and one to King Messiah.—*Yalkut in loco* (also *Tanchuma in loco*).

➤CONTRIBUTED NOTES.◀

"Professor Peters' Notes."—The January number of *HEBRAICA* contained quite a number of suggestive articles, among which were the interesting notes of Professor Peters. His explanation of the ending *ות* in Hebrew (in *אבות*, for instance) as identical in origin with the ending *û ti* of masc. adjectives and nouns in Assyrian is quite correct. For the sake of preserving the historical character of our science,¹ I should like to call attention to the fact that, in the preface (p. xxxvii) to his *Akkadische Sprache* (Berlin, 1883), Professor Haupt has already remarked, "*abûti*² *Väter* = Hebr. *אבות*, was nicht aus **abâti* entstanden ist." These few words contain the whole story, since they assert that Hebrew *אבות* is a masculine and not a feminine formation.

Similarly for his remarks about *šadû* *mountain* being equal to *שָׂדֶה* *field*,³ Dr. Peters might have quoted *HEBRAICA*, vol. I, p. 181, note 1.

That *û* and *â* were respectively the masculine and feminine perfect third person plural endings in primitive Semitic seems quite probable, if we grant that primitive Semitic possessed a perfect. More than that, the examples Dr. Peters cites (the Chinese pronunciation of Ethiopic *nagarû*, *nagarâ* included) would not prove. For the explanation of the forms *צִעְרָה*, Gen. XLIX. 22, and *קָמָה*, 1 Sam. iv. 15, it will suffice to refer to Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar*, § 146: 3 and 4; Müller-Robertson's *Outlines of Hebrew Syntax*, § 507: 1; Wright's *Arabic Grammar*, vol. II., 146.

The ingenious explanation of the form *יָקַמְל* may safely be passed over in silence. Very problematical is the combination of Hebrew *אָז* with Assyrian *a d ê*. I know of no case in which *ז* in Hebrew corresponds to *ך* in Assyrian³ and since we have Hebrew *עָר*, poetic *עָרִי*, I see no need of setting up a new phonetic law.

CYRUS ADLER,

Johns Hopkins University.

¹ See the conclusion of Prof. Paul Haupt's review of Delitzsch's "*Kosseans*," in the *Andover Review*, July, 1884, p. 98; and Dr. Bezold's reference to the passage in the preface (p. 7) to his *Babylonische Literatur*.

² *abûti* itself never occurs; a parallel form, however, is *šibûtu* *elders*, in the *Deluge*, I., 31.

³ Nobody would bring forward in support of this the combination of *piazu* and Arabic *قَهْدٌ* *hunting leopard*, and *kurkizammu* and *كَرْكَدَنْ*, Ethiopic *karkand* (Delitzsch, *Assyrische Studien* 61:47; Hommel, *Saeugethiere*, 301:2), especially since Dr. Jensen has shown, in the *Zeitschrift fuer Assyriologie*, I., 311, that *piazu*, or *biazu*, means "hog," just like *šahu* *wild boar*, fem. *šahîtu*; and *humšîru*, Hebrew *חֲזִיר*, Arabic *خنزير*.

➤BOOK NOTICES.◀

BEZOLD'S BABYLONISCH-ASSYRISCHE LITERATUR.*

By the publication of this book Bezold has placed all Assyriologists under great obligations to him. It contains useful and necessary information for beginners in this department as well as for advanced students and authorities. The former can find in it a short history of the discoveries, a list of all the important historical texts together with a complete bibliography of the literature connected with these texts. Its chief value to the latter lies in the index to the British Museum and other tablets, and in the bibliography.

The nature of the book is such that an idea of the great amount of labor expended in its preparation and of the value to all Assyrian students of the topics treated can only be obtained from a list of contents. After an introduction and a Chronological *Excurs*, under the HISTORICAL INSCRIPTIONS, in §§ 12-82, are taken up those of the Kings, viz.: 1. The inscriptions of the old Babylonian kings. 2. Those of the old Assyrian kings up to the beginning of the Eponym canon. 3. Those of the Assyrian kings from Ašûrnâsirpal to Ašûrbanipal. 4. Those of the Babylonian kings from Ramânapiliddina up to the end of the New-Babylonian kingdom; the Achæmenian and Seleucidæan inscriptions. Under C, in §§ 83-95, we have the contract tablets, letters, etc. II. NON-HISTORICAL INSCRIPTIONS. A. The poetical literature. 1. Epics; legends; fables. 2. Penitential psalms and hymns; prayers and songs. 3. Magical formulas, etc. B. The scientific literature. 1. Grammatical and lexicographical collections. 2. Geographical lists. 3. Mathematical, astronomical, astrological and mythological inscriptions. 4. Remains of medical and "literary" works. By far the most interesting to advanced students are the separate lists of the tablets in the Kujundschick, George Smith and Rassam collections. Each one of these tablets is described as fully as was possible at the time of publication.

The author has given us a book, the intrinsic value, completeness, typographical appearance, etc., of which recommend it to all Assyrian students.

ROBERT F. HARPER.

DERENBOURG'S "LA SCIENCE DES RELIGIONS ET L'ISLAMISME."†

A most gratifying testimony to the importance which the young science of religion has assumed is furnished by the recent establishment at Paris, already so rich in its provisions for higher studies in all departments of research, of a special

* Kurzgefasster Ueberblick über die babylonisch-assyrische Literatur nebst einem chronologischen *Excurs*, zwei Registern und einem Index zu 1700 Thontafeln des Britisch-Museums, herausgegeben von Carl Bezold. Leipzig: *Otto Schulz*, 1886. 8vo, pp. 394, price, M.12.

† LA SCIENCE DES RELIGIONS ET L'ISLAMISME. Par Hartwig Derenbourg. Paris: *Leroux*. 1886. pp. 95. fr.2.50

school for the *sciences religieuses*. As the first of the kind, unless we include the (former) theological department of the University of Leyden, which some years ago was removed from its dogmatic to a purely scientific basis and was practically incorporated with the historical section of the university, it deserves our special attention, and its development will be watched with deep interest by all who are alive to the important results which may be expected from the scientific investigation and critical study of religions, of the development of religious thought and practices, of the growth of doctrines, dogmas and ceremonies. At the head of the new school stands the eminent Professor of the Science of Religion at the Collège du France, Albert Reville, whose name alone is a sufficient guarantee for the high rank which the new departure will take; and the brilliant array of scholars gathered around Reville, including such men as Maurice Vernes, Ernest Havet, Hartwig Derenbourg, E. Lefebure and A. Bergaigne (to which we should like to see added Ernest Renan), warrant the holding out of the very highest expectations. In the spring of 1886, the faculty, consisting of thirteen professors, was organized and courses announced embracing a large variety of subjects appertaining to the religions of India, China, Japan, Greece and Rome, as well as the critical study of the origin and development of Judaism, Christianity and Mahomedanism.

The interesting little volume before us embodies two lectures delivered by Prof. Hartwig Derenbourg as an introduction to the courses in the department assigned to him, namely, the religion, or rather religions of Islam. He starts out with a picture of the condition of Arabic studies in France when he began his career seventeen years ago, which is desolate enough to reassure even those who take a despairing view of the prospects for the study in this country. With a good deal of humor he describes the character of a very slim audience that gathered around him in a room of the Sarbonne, and who seem to have come more out of pity for the young savant than because of any attraction which the study of the Arabic grammar and the Koran had for them. Derenbourg was careful, as he tells us, not to impose any tasks on his "hearers,"—they could not be called his pupils,—for fear of losing them entirely. After holding up in contrast the brighter picture furnished by the present, Derenbourg enters upon an examination of the scope and aim of the science of religion, the methods of study and the means at our disposal. He shows that, while the science of religion borrows largely from philosophy, archæology, anthropology and ethnography, it is properly to be classed as a branch of historical studies. In pursuing his work, the investigator is to be actuated by no motive save the desire to understand and to explain in a natural manner phenomena which present themselves to his notice. He is not to place himself in the position of an advocate or of an opponent; and while rigidly excluding the supernatural as lying entirely outside of his province, he is to maintain that "spirit of respectful sympathy" which all religions as "the great efforts of the human spirit, efforts which represent the best labors and hopes of mankind," merit. In the second lecture Derenbourg gives an admirable sketch of the religious movement inaugurated by Mohammed, such as, for compactness and at the same time clearness—the whole covering only sixty pages—we do not remember to have seen surpassed. It reminds one forcibly of Nöldeke's sketch of the "Life of Mohammed," from which one obtains a far better picture of the general course of the prophet's career than from Sprenger's exhaustive work, notwithstanding the excellent qualities of the latter. We are

glad to see Derenbourg lay stress upon the necessity of studying, by such means as are at our disposal, the period preceding Mahommed as the *sine qua non* for the understanding of the religion that bears his name. The notion that any religion can sprout up, as it were, over night, or that people suddenly wake up to a recognition that henceforth their worship must be confined to one Deity, instead of many, is well-nigh exploded. A religion cannot properly be said to have been "founded" least of all by a single person; it is a growth, and the appearance of Mahommed—like that of all religious reformers—marks simply an important stage—a turning-point, if you will—in the development of religion among the Arabs, the beginnings of which must be sought in a period long prior to his coming. The ground had gradually been prepared to receive the seed sown by him, and this preparation was certainly equal in importance to the sowing of the seed. In addition to such valuable sources for studying the pre-islamitic times as the "Kitâb al Agâni" ("Book of Songs") we have now fortunately a number of ancient monuments, notably the Himyaritic inscriptions, which furnish us with most precious, though scant, data of pre-islamitic conditions. Such "finds" as the inscriptions discovered at Teima, some years ago, are an augury of what is still in store for future explorers. The conviction has gained ground among scholars that the interior of Arabia, unfortunately at present practically inaccessible because of the dangers attending the traveler, is filled with stone monuments of all kinds dating from the days anterior to Mohammed.

Another point upon which Derenbourg justly lays great stress is the services which Abou Bekr, and more especially Omar, rendered to Mahomedanism. His summing up in this connection merits quoting: "What the prophets of Israel were for Judaism, what St. Paul was for Christianity, Abou Bekr and Omar were for Islam." The sword of Omar accomplished what the visions of Mahommed failed to do; and indeed but for Omar, the efforts of Mahommed would have resulted in total failure. Not only does Omar's conversion mark a turning-point in the fortunes of the prophet, who until then had made little if any headway, but the different tactics introduced by Omar, more particularly after Mahommed's death, first gained for the new movement a foot-hold among the Arab tribes, so that, while Mahommed must be put down as the inaugurator of the great movement, Omar is the real *leader* of it. To have united under one banner tribes scattered over a great area and engaged in constant warfare with each other, and to have roused a people cowardly by nature to a pitch of enthusiasm which enabled them to face death in the battle-field with calm resignation, nay, to hail it with joy, remains an everlasting testimony to Omar's eminent genius, to which is due the wonderful spread of a religion that numbers more than one hundred and seventy-five millions, and so far from being on the decline, as we sometimes see it stated, is still growing.

Professor Derenbourg stands to-day in the foremost rank of oriental scholars, and the high reputation which he enjoys has lately been still further enhanced by his edition of the grammatical work of the famous Sibawaihi. Suffice it to say that the little volume before us is worthy of the successor of Silvestre De Sacy, whose chair for the Arabic language and literature at the "Ecole Speciale des Langues Orientales Vivantes" Professor Derenbourg at present holds.

PROF. MORRIS JASTROW, JR., PH. D.,
Philadelphia.

➤SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.◀

- ABEL, C. Einleitung in ein ägyptisch-semitisch-indoeuropaisches Wurzelwörterbuch. Leipzig. Pp. 532.\$36.70
- AMELINEAU, A. Le christianisme chez les anciens coptes. *Revue de l'hist. des religions*, Tome IV. No. 3.
- Un document copte du XIII. siècle. *Journ. asiatique*. IX. 2.
- On the Sahidic Translation of the Book of Job. *PSBA*. vol. IX.
- AMIAUD, ARTHUR. The Various Names of Sumer and Akkad in the Cuneiform Texts. *Bab. and Orient Record*, June, '87.
- BAETHGEN, FRIEDRICH. Siebzehn makkabäische Psalmen nach Theodor von Mopsuestia. (Schluss.) *Ztschr. f. alttest. Wissensch.*, '87, Heft. 1.
- BALL, C. J. The Metrical Structure of Qînôth; the Book of Lamentations, arranged according to the original measures. *PSBA*. vol. IX.
- BERGER, PHILIPPI. On Inscriptions discovered in Cyprus. *Ibid.*
- BERTHELOT. Sur quelques métaux et minéraux provenant de l'antique Chaldée. *Revue archeologique*, Jan.-Fév., '87.
- BROWN, ROBERT, JR. On Euphratean Names of the Constellation "Ursa Major." *PSBA*. vol. IX.
- BUDGE, E. A. W. Anecdota Oxoniensa (Semitic Series). Vol. I. Part II. The Book of the Bee. *Amer. Journ. of Phil.* (Isaac H. Hall).
- CASARTELLI, L. C. Pehlevi Notes. I. The Semitic Verb in Pehlevi. *Bab. and Orient. Record*, Apr., '87.
- CHWOLSON, D. Syrische Grabinschriften aus Semerjetschie, hrsg. u. erklärt. Mit 1 Tafel. St. Pétersbourg: *Egger et Cie*. 1887.M.2.
- DELITZSCH, FRIED. Prolegomena eines neuen hebräisch-aramaischen Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testament. *Lit. Centblt.*, May 28, '87; *ZDMG*. Band XL. (Th. Nöldeke); *Revue des Etudes Juives*, '87 I. (J. Halévy).
- Assyrisches Wörterbuch zur gesammten bisher veröffentlichten Keilschriftliteratur unter Berücksichtigung zahlreicher unveröffentlichter Texte. Lief. I. Leipzig: *Hinrichs*. 1887.\$11.55
- Assyrl. Wörterbuch. *Bab. and Orient. Record*, June, '87. (Bel-ibnu).
- DELATTRE. L'Asie occidentale dans les inscriptions assyriennes. *Litblt. f. orient. Phil.* III. 3 (J. Oppert).
- LEVI, S. Vocabulario geroglifico copto-ebraico. Vol. I. Turin: *Loescher*. .30fr.
- TAWROGI, A. J. Der talmudische Tractat Derech Erez sutta nach Handschriften und seltenen Ausgaben mit Parallelstellen und Varianten kritisch bearbeitet, übersetzt u. erläutert. *Lit. Centriblt.* (H. Strack).
- SCHWARZLOZE, FRIED. W. Die Waffen der alten Araber aus ihren Dichtern dargestellt. Ein Beitrag zur arabischen Alterthumskunde, Synonymik und Lexikographie nebst Registern. Leipzig: *Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung*, 1886. xvi, 39 S. gr. 8.M.12.
- DUVAL, A. Notes sur la Peschito. *Revue des Etudes Juives*, '87, I.
- EGERS, JACOB. Diwân des Abraham Ibn Esra mit seiner Allegorie Hai Ben Mekiz. *Deutsche Lit.*, April 9, '87 (D. Hoffmann).
- FROTHINGHAM, A. L., JR. Stephen Bar Sudaili, the Syrian Mystic and the book of Hierotheos. *Theol. Lit.*, May 21, '87 (F. Baethgen).

GINSBURG, CHRISTIAN G. The Massorah compiled from Manuscripts alphabetically and lexically arranged. In 2 vols. London, 1880—1883.

והמסרה על פי כתבי יד עתיקים אשר נקבצו מארצות שונות
במחברם אחת שלמה ערכה בכל סדורה במערכות אלפא ביתא
ועל פי השרשים [ZDMG. Band XL. Heft IV. (S. Baer).]

HIRSCHFELD. Beiträge zur Erklärung des Korân. *Liblt. f. orient. Phil.*, III. 3 (Goldziher).

JASTROW, M. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature. I. *Andover Rev.*, June, '87 (Geo. F. Moore).

KLAMROTH, M. Ueber die Auszüge aus griechischen Schriftstellern bei Al-Ja'qûbi. *ZDMG.* Band XL. Heft 4.

KUENEN, A. In *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 21st Jaargang—11^{de} Stuk: G. d'Eichthal, *Melanges de Critique Biblique*; J. Bloch, *Krit. Untersuchung über Abfassung, Charakter u. Tendenz des B. Esther*; E. Nestle, *Septuagintastudien*; J. Halévy, *Considerations supplémentaires sur x^e Chapitre de la Genèse*; Clermont Ganneau, over Dan. v. 25—28; J. J. P. Valetton, *Viertal Voorlezingen over Profeten des Ouden Verbonds*.

LANG, CARL. Mu'tadid als Prinz und Regent, ein historisches Heldengedicht von Ibn el Mu'tazz. *ZDMG.* XL. Heft. 4.

MEYNARD, DE. Menontcheri, poète persan du XI siècle. *Journ. asiatique*, IX. 2.

MONTET, EDOUARD. La religion et le théâtre en Perse. *Rev. de l'hist. des religions*, Tome IV. No. 3.

MUELLER. Sabäische Alterthümer in den K. Museen zu Berlin. *Liblt. f. orient. Phil.*, III. 2 (Praetorius).

PHILIPPI, FR. Die Aussprache der semitischen Consonanten ך und ך'. Eine Abhandl. über die Natur dieser Laute. *ZDMG.* XL. 4.

PINCHES, THEO. G. Tablets referring to the Apprenticeship of Slaves at Babylon. *Bab. and Orient. Record*, Apr., '87.

— Glimpses of Babylonian and Assyrian Life. *Ibid.*, June, '87.

POGNON, H. Sur un plat avec inscription punique. *Journ. Asiatique*, IX. 2.

— Les inscriptions Babyloniennes du Wadi-Brissa. Paris: Vieweg. . . . 10fr.

RECKENDORF, S. Ueber den Werth der altäthiopischen Pentateuchübersetzung für die Reconstruction der Septuaginta. *Ztschr. f. Alttest. Wiss.*, '87, I.

REVILLOUT, E. and V. Sworn Obligations in Egyptian and Babylonian Law. *Bab. and Orient. Record*, May, '87.

REVILLOUT, V. A Settlement of Accounts in Nabopolassar's Time. *Ibid.*, June, '87.

SACHAU, ED. Alberuni's India; the Religion, Philosophy, Literature, etc., of India, edited in the Arabic original. . . . 63sh.

SMEND & SOGIN. Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab. *Deutsche Litztng.*, Apr. 30, '87 (J. Euting).

STERN. Die koptische Apocalypse des Sophonias, mit einem Anhang über den untersahidischen Dialekt. *Ztschr. f. ägypt. Sprache*, '86, 3, 4.

WAHRMUND, ADOLF. Praktisches Handbuch der neuarabischen Sprache, mit Schlüssel. *Deutsche Lit.*, June 4, '86.

WARD, WM. HAYES. Some Babylonian Cylinders. *Bab. and Orient Record*, June, '87.

GENERAL INDEX.

Bennett, William Henry, Notes on a Comparison of the Texts of Psalm XVIII. and 2 Samuel XXII.....	65
— Notes on the Use of the Hebrew Tenses.....	22
Bibliography, Semitic.....	62, 127, 191, 273
Book Notices: Bezold's <i>Babylonisch-Assyrische Literatur</i> , 270; Bezold's <i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</i> , 57; Derenbourg's <i>La Science des Religions et l'Islamisme</i> , 270; Friedrich Delitzsch's <i>Prolegomena</i> , 122; Jewish Literature, 120; Lansing's <i>Arabic Manual</i> , 56; Lyon's <i>Assyrian Manual</i> , 53; Neubauer's <i>Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts</i> , 59; Prætorius' <i>Grammatica Æthiopica</i> , 58; S. A. Smith's <i>Asurbanipaltexte</i> , 189; Smend and Socin, <i>Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab</i> , 124; Vatke's <i>Old Testament Introduction</i> , 188.	
Briggs, Prof. Charles A., <i>The Strophical Organization of Hebrew Trimeters</i> ..	152
Cheyne, Rev. Prof. T. K., Notes on נְפִילִים, מְבוֹל, etc.....	175
Clermont-Ganneau, Prof. M., <i>Mene, Tekel, Peres, and the Feast of Belshazzar</i>	87
Composite Character of Exodus I., II., <i>The Alleged</i>	1
Contributed Notes: <i>Cyrus Adler</i> , Professor Peters' Notes, 269; <i>M. A. Altshuebler</i> , Some Textual Remarks on the Old Testament, 117; An Examination on Psalms XL.—LXXII., 46; <i>Richard J. H. Gottheil</i> , Syriac and Assyrian, 187; <i>Isaac H. Hall</i> , An Old English Semitic Series, 118; <i>Henry S. Morais</i> , Abraham Firkowitsch, 44, Neubauer's Etymologies, 186; Mr. Bennett's Articles on the Hebrew Tenses, 45; <i>H. J. Weber</i> , Notes on Malachi, 43; <i>Nathaniel West</i> , Diquduq, 41.	
Craig, James A., <i>The Monolith Inscription of Salmaneser II.</i>	201
Crane, Rev. Oliver Turnbull, <i>Tikkun Sopherim</i>	233
Dembitz, L. N., <i>The Passive of Qal</i>	39
Editorial Notes: A New Volume, 49; A Note from Professor Hall, 51; A Little Knowledge of Hebrew, 50; An Essay on the Book of Proverbs, 51; Comparison of Greek and Hebrew, 50; Dr. Jastrow's Dictionary, 49; The Present Number, 49; The Study of Syriac, 51.	
Edwards, Rev. John, <i>Genesis II. 25 and XLVIII. 10</i>	263
Esarhaddon Inscriptions as published in I R., 45-47, and III R., 15, 16, Some Corrections to the Texts of Cylinders A and B of the.....	177
Etymology of Nekasim, On the.....	107
Feast of Belshazzar, Mene, Tekel, Peres, and the.....	87
Felsenthal, Rabbi B., <i>S. J. Finn's New Hebrew Dictionary</i>	255
Genesis II. 25 and XLVIII. 10.....	263
Gottheil, Richard J. H., Kottek's "Das Sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum." 136	

Gottheil, Richard J. H., A Synopsis of Greek Philosophy by Bar 'Ebh râyâ...	249
Greek Philosophy, A Synopsis of by Bar 'Ebh râyâ...	249
Green, Prof. W. Henry, The Alleged Composite Character of Exodus I., II.	1
Harper, Robert F., Some Corrections to the Texts of Cylinders A and B of the Esarhaddon Inscriptions as published in I R., 45-47, and III R., 15, 16	177
Haupt, Prof. Paul, On the Etymology of Nekasim	107
Hebrew Dictionary, S. J. Finn's New	255
Hebrew Tenses, Notes on the Use of the	22
Inheritance in Ancient Babylonia, The Law of	13
Inscription of Nebuchadnezzar, Variants of an Unpublished Duplicate of the New York Cylinder	166
Jastrow, Prof. Morris W., Jewish Grammarians of the Middle Ages	103, 171
Jeremiah, The Text of	193
Jewish Grammarians of the Middle Ages	103, 171
Kottek's "Das Sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum"	136
מְבֹרִי, נְפִילִים, etc., Notes on	175
Mene, Tekel, Peres, and the Feast of Belshazzar	87
Miscellaneous Notes: Feminine Plural of Verbs; Masculine Plural in ôth; Waw Consecutive with the Imperfect; The Use of Numbers in Hebrew; Judges V. 30; The Meaning of שָׂדֶה	111
Monolith Inscription of Salmaneser II., The	201
Nekasim, On the Etymology of	107
מְבֹרִי, etc., Notes on	175
Nordell, Rev. Philip A., On the Synonyms קָהַל and עֵדָה	129
O'Connor, Rev. J. F. X., Inscription of Nebuchadnezzar, Variants of an Unpublished Duplicate of the New York Cylinder	166
Old Testament Passages Messianically Applied by the Ancient Synagogue, 30,	265
Peters, Prof. John P., Miscellaneous Notes	111
Pick, Rev. B., Old Testament Passages Messianically Applied by the Ancient Synagogue	30, 265
Pinches, Theo. G., The Law of Inheritance in Ancient Babylonia	13
Psalms LXXIV. 4, 5, Notes on	261
Psalms XVIII. and 2 Samuel XXII., Notes on a Comparison of the Texts of	65
Qal, The Passive of	39
Rogers, Robert W., Mene, Tekel, Peres, and the Feast of Belshazzar (by Prof. M. Clermont-Ganneau), translated by	87
2 Samuel XXII., Notes on a Comparison of the Texts of Psalm XVIII. and	65
Smith, Prof. Henry Preserved, The Text of Jeremiah	193
Strophical Organization of Hebrew Trimeters, The	152
Synonyms קָהַל and עֵדָה, On the	129
Tikkun Sopherim	233
Woods, Rev. F. H., Notes on Ps. LXXIV. 4, 5	261

